

S. D. A. GEN. CONF. LIBRARY

S1
N.2

2

Pamphlets

A BOOK FOR EVERYBODY.

THE

KINGDOM OF GOD:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PROPHECIES RELATIVE TO THE TIME AND MANNER OF ITS ESTABLISHMENT; OR A REFUTATION OF THE DOCTRINE CALLED,

THE AGE TO COME.

BY J. H. WAGGONER.

STEAM PRESS OF THE REVIEW AND HERALD OFFICE.
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

1859.

HERITAGE ROOM

JAMES WHITE LIBRARY
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
BERRIEN SPRING, MICHIGAN
HERITAGE ROOM

INTRODUCTION

It has been well remarked that much of the controversy amongst men arises from a misunderstanding of each other's language, or a misapprehension of terms. This is the first difficulty. Beyond this a pride of opinion and love of triumph prevents many from acknowledging the plainest principles of reasoning. With such it is no use to reason. They will yield to other influences, but not to reason. No matter how plainly a point is proved, the further we argue with them, the more confusion will be the result.

Thus, if I affirm that a sheet of paper is white, and another declares that it is black, it is evident that our opinions of color are so different that we could come to no satisfactory conclusions by examining a hundred other articles. We should only increase the difference between us a hundred fold.

Again, if I affirm that two and two make four, and another denies it, and insists that two and two make five, it will do us no good to engage in a strife of arithmetical calculations, as an *agreement in the result would be impossible*. We must first agree on elementary truths, or *first principles*.

Many try to *evade* a difficulty without *correcting* it. It is of no use to admit that two halves are

equal to the whole, unless we apply the principle in all our calculations. No matter how learned a man may be, he can never demonstrate a proposition if he loses sight of elementary truths. It is just as necessary for the teacher of algebra to add two and three correctly, as it is for the small scholar in the first arithmetic. These plain principles, if applied to questions of faith and morality, would prevent confusion, and tend to bring the children of God to "the unity of the faith."

The principles of christian liberty are but little understood. As there is a great difference between liberty and licentiousness, so there is a just medium between tyranny and anarchy; between oppressive strictness and confusion. He who is restive under just restraint, knows nothing of true freedom. The questions will then arise, What is true Christian liberty? How far may we think *as we please*? And what restraint shall be placed on our faith?

(1.) We may entertain our own faith without regard to the will of our fellow men, whether they appear as popes, kings, councils, inquisitors, or church committees; that is, it is not for them to regulate our faith, or determine what we may or may not believe. The highest office of the servants of God is that of "ambassadors for Christ;" they are not legislators, judges, nor executioners.

(2.) We may *not* entertain any faith contrary to God's revelation. Though man has no right to control our faith, *God has*: for "he that believeth not God hath made him a liar," [1 John v, 10,] for which offense he will be held to an account. If this were not so, and if God had given

to all the right and privilege to think and believe what they pleased, he would be unjust in punishing unbelief, as it would only be the exercise of a given right. As he will punish unbelief, he has a right to *guide our faith*, and as his word is truth, and does not teach yea and nay, he has a right to require that we should all be one—speak the same thing—be of one mind—come to the unity of the faith, and keep the unity of the Spirit.

Then the oft repeated difficulties—"we can't all see alike—every man has a right to his own opinion—learned men disagree," &c., have their origin in *unbelief* and *self-will*, and are a libel on the gospel, and a special plea for infidelity.

But can these principles be so applied as to settle the controversy in the theological world on the fulfillment of prophecy? I should say, yes! without any hesitation; but the plainest principles will settle no controversy *if not acknowledged and applied*. General terms must be explained by those more particular, and the indefinite must be made to harmonize with the definite. On every Bible doctrine Bible expressions may be found in *plain, direct terms*, that is, such as contain no symbols or figures, or only such figures and forms of speech as are of common use, and easily understood. **THESE ARE DECISIVE**; and *all our interpretations of prophecy must harmonize with them*. This is "*true literalism*," and may not be dispensed with, for any consideration. By these principles and this rule we shall endeavor to abide in our investigations in the following pages.

In order to bring the subject before the mind at once, so that we may take a comprehensive

view of the whole field, I will present three questions, correct answers to which will settle the whole controversy.

1. Do the scriptures teach that the world will be converted, and that a majority of mankind will be saved? Or do they teach that the world will grow worse and worse, and that in numbers the saved will be to the lost as the few to the many?

2. Do the scriptures teach that only two classes will exist at the coming of Christ, the righteous and the wicked, one to be saved and the other destroyed? Or do they teach the existence of a third class, neither righteous nor wicked, justified nor condemned, subjects of neither law nor grace, who will have no interest in the events of that day?

3. Do the scriptures teach the pre-eminence of the Jews, and their exclusive right to certain promises in the New Covenant? Or, do they teach the unity of the household of faith, and a perfect equality in respect to God's promises in the New Covenant, and that all *special* privileges and promises to the Jews belonged to the old covenant now done away?

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

CHAPTER I.

TEMPORAL MILLENNIUM.

The doctrine of a temporal millennium, or the world's conversion, is not taught in the word of God. We learn this (1.) from the explicit declarations of scripture, and (2.) from the great chains of prophecy, or prophetic outlines of this world's history. Some writers and speakers quote largely from the prophets to prove the doctrine, but *their views do not harmonize with the direct declarations of the word*; hence their expositions are wrong. One plain declaration of scripture is sufficient to overthrow a whole theory, and demolish volumes of human reasoning, if they conflict with it. It is well to settle the facts respecting the *object* and *results* of the present age, before passing to the examination of another.

A late eminent theological writer, Prof. Finney, made this doctrine *one of necessity*, as based on the attributes of Deity. Thus: the majority of mankind have been wicked in the past, and if the present dispensation should close soon, or if the majority of future generations should also be wicked, the ultimate number of the wicked would greatly overbalance the number of the righteous, and thus the majority of mankind would be lost. But to say that the majority will be lost, is to say that

God's plan of salvation is deficient in power or benevolence; for infinite power *could* save the majority, and infinite benevolence *would* save them. Hence God's attributes are a sufficient guaranty that a majority will be saved. For we can only judge of the attributes of Deity by their manifestation to us; but if he should fail to save the greatest number, malevolence, and not benevolence, would predominate in his character.*

I scarcely know how to characterize this argument in correct terms, as it involves the character and government of God in the most serious consequences. For,

1. If it proves anything, it proves universal salvation; for if the benevolence of God must be measured by the scale of the saved and lost, there could be none lost, as his benevolence is infinite, and he has no malevolence to claim a share.

2. The position that if a majority are lost it is proof of a deficiency in the divine plan, involves the position that the number saved must be according to the number embraced in the plan, and therefore the plan could not embrace all.

3. It makes the character or nature of the plan of salvation *contingent* on man's acceptance of it; that is, it is benevolent if a majority accepts it; if not it is malevolent.

4. It directly denies the free agency of man, making it *necessary* on the part of God to save a majority without regard to their willingness or choice to be saved. Or,

*See *Discussion on the Second Advent Near*, by Fitch, Cowles, Mahan, &c., p. 5.

5. If man is left to choose, he has it in *his choice* to make God benevolent or malevolent, thus making his attribute depend on the action of his creatures!

6. It denies the *infinity* of God's benevolence by making it a question of degrees; for, according to it, if the majority are saved, his benevolence would be predominant, but if the majority are lost, malevolence would predominate. And of course, if the numbers of the saved and lost were about equal, it would be impossible to determine the character of God!

And the argument charges the worst of these conclusions on the divine government, for the scripture says the number of the saved *will be* to that of the lost as the few to the many. But the benevolence of God and the love of his Son are determined, not by the number that *will* come, but by a provision of free salvation for *all*, so that *who-soever will, may* come and have eternal life. If men will not accept the offer, it does not show any want of love in him by whom the offer is made: it only shows their folly and hardness of heart.

This subject may be conclusively settled by an examination of a few points of testimony; these are furnished in the word in such plain terms that their import is unmistakable.

1. The way to life is narrow and few find it; but the way to destruction is broad and many walk in it. Matt. vii, 13, 14. There is not an intimation in the Bible that the way to life will become so wide that all will walk therein, and the way to destruction so narrow that few or none will find it. See also Luke xiii, 24, 25.

2. The redeemed come out of great tribulation, Rev. vii, 9-15. The Saviour told his disciples: "In the world ye shall have tribulation." John xvi, 33. Paul said, "We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." Acts xiv, 22. The scriptures nowhere present another company who enter into the kingdom of God through great ease and worldly prosperity.

3. The Saviour did not promise his ministers that all should believe their word. He did not give them to expect that they should meet with the favor of the world any more than he had. But he said: "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own." And "the servant is not greater than his Lord. If they have persecuted me they will also persecute you; and if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also." John xv, 19, 20. And again when the Jews reviled him he said to his followers: "If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" Matt. x, 25. Who dares to rise above his Lord and say he will be exempt from persecution? Who seeks to be free from the sufferings of his Master? The scriptures teach that the Captain of our salvation was made "perfect through sufferings;" that he was a partaker of our infirmities, that "in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest." Heb. ii, 10-17. But they also teach as clear a necessity that we should suffer affliction or tribulation with him in the gospel. To this his followers are appointed. 1 Thess. iii, 3. It is consequent upon a godly life. 2 Tim. iii, 12. It

is the way to the kingdom. Acts xiv, 22. It stands connected with blessings in this life, and life in the world to come. Mark x, 29, 30. It is necessary to try or prove our faith. 1 Pet. i, 7. It works patience. Rom. v, 3. It yields the peaceable fruit of righteousness. Heb. xii, 11. It works for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. 2 Cor. iv, 17. It is the realization of Christ's sympathy for his members. Heb. iv, 15. It is the measure of Christ's affliction filled up for the church. Col. i, 24. It is the fellowship of his sufferings in which we are made conformable to his death. Phil. iii, 10. It is partaking of his sufferings. 2 Pet. iv, 13. And will all be counted *as his own* in the day of his coming. Matt. xxv, 40, 45. According to the commonly received view of the Millennium, not one of the above glorious truths will apply to that state. That age will need another gospel. It is a *dangerous doctrine*, calculated to destroy the piety of the believer, by turning his mind to a state of ease; a state free from trials, endurance, persecution, chastisement, temptation, or any of the traits of christian watchfulness and forbearance. The influence of such a belief is apparent in the worldly-mindedness, slothfulness and self-exaltation of the churches of the present age, by which they are acting out the cry of "peace and safety" for the last days. 1 Thess. v, 3.

4. The gospel was not expected to convert the world, but to *call out of the world* a people to glorify God. "Ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world." John xv, 19. "God at the first did visit the Gentiles to take *out of*

them a people for his name." Acts xv, 14. The saints of God are redeemed "*out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.*" Rev. v, 9.

5. The Saviour taught that wickedness would prevail on earth till his coming, or to the end of the world. In Matt. xiii, 24-30, is the parable of the tares of the field, which is explained in verses 37-41, wherein it is shown that the tares, the children of the wicked one, and the wheat, the children of the kingdom, shall grow together till the harvest, which is the end of the world, and the reapers the angels of God, will make the separation at the coming of Christ. See Matt. xxiv, 30, 31.

6. The last days will be days of peril. This could not be true if the church was to triumph on the earth in the last days, or if the world was to be finally converted. When speaking of his coming and of the end of the world the Saviour said: "And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." Matt. xxiv, 12-14. In this chapter we notice (1.) Before the end comes, iniquity shall abound. (2.) Endurance will be necessary even to the end. (3.) The gospel will not convert all nations, but be for a witness unto all nations. (4.) In verse 24 is predicted that false christs and false prophets shall arise to deceive, if possible, the very elect. (5.) In verses 42-50, it is shown that even some of the called servants of God will become slothful and wicked, and not be prepared for the

coming of Christ, but finally have their portion with the hypocrites.

Said Paul: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." 2 Tim. iii, 1-5. This is according to what the Saviour said: iniquity shall abound, and the love of many shall wax cold. And Paul further says, [verse 12,] "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." Thus in the last days perils and persecutions will surround the true church, because the mass of those who profess godliness, or have its form, will deny its power.

Peter said: "There shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming!" 2 Pet. iii, 3, 4. How could these scoffers arise and deny his coming, and persecutions and perils exist, if all were converted long before his coming?

Our Saviour has given scripture examples on this subject: "And as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought,

they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be when the Son of man is revealed." Luke xvii, 26-30.

These are plain, definite declarations. They need no studied argument to show their force as applied to this question. The only mystery is that any will presume to offer their "expositions of prophecy" to sustain theories conflicting with such plain statements.

But there are other New Testament proofs on this subject, upon which there will perhaps be as little diversity of opinion amongst the generality of Bible believers as upon the above positive testimonies. It is generally held by the Protestant world that the revelation of the Man of Sin marks the rise of the Roman apostasy. Of his end Paul says, "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and destroy with the brightness of his coming." 2 Thess. ii, 8. That "his coming" is literal, (not merely his spiritual presence, or a general diffusion of his principles, as is often taught,) is evident, for, (1.) This is the subject introduced in this chapter. Verses 1, 2. (2.) Reference is made to a former letter [verse 2] in which the personal appearing of the Saviour is taught. 1 Thess. iv, 13-18. (3.) With his coming is associated "our gathering together unto him." Comp. Matt. xiii, 24-30, 37-43; xxiv, 29-31: xxv, 31, 32; 1 Thess. iv, 17, 18. By establishing these facts another point is established, namely, the Man of Sin—the Son of Perdition—that Wicked, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or is

worshiped, will not be destroyed until the coming of Christ. This fact is destructive of the doctrine of the millennium.

Again, it must be admitted that the seven trumpets of Rev. viii—xi, reach to the end of this age. Events under the seventh trumpet prove this; such as the anger of the nations, the wrath of God, the time that the dead should be judged, and of rewarding the saints. But the last trumpet introduces a woe upon the inhabitants of the earth, and not a blessing; the anger of the nations, and not peace; and it is easily proved that the seven last plagues, in which "is filled up the wrath of God," (Rev. xv, 1,) are poured out under this trumpet. This point cannot be evaded by allowing a period of apostasy *after* the millennium; for the Man of Sin exists from the falling away to the Saviour's advent; and the three last trumpets are woe trumpets, and not the last alone. Rev. viii, 13; ix, 12; xi, 14. Testimony similar to this may be adduced from the other prophetic writings, but we reserve it for another branch of our subject.

Some suppose that because the heathen will be given to Christ, and the uttermost parts of the earth, that he will therefore as Saviour of sinners, possess them, convert them, and forgive their sins. But they seem to forget that Christ is to put off the robes of his priesthood, and put on the garments of vengeance. Isa. lix, 17. They do not consider that "the day of salvation" will close, and the "great day of his wrath" will come. Rev. vi, 16, 17. The Saviour ascended on high as a priest or intercessor, and is there to sit down at his Father's right hand till his foes are made

his footstool. Ps. cx, 1. And then will Ps. ii, 8, 9, be fulfilled which reads: "Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt rule them *with a rod of iron*, thou shalt *dash them in pieces* like a potter's vessel." No conversion is contemplated here; they are given into his hands to be destroyed, or broken and dashed in pieces. This is when the great day of his wrath is come; when the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men; would hide from his presence. Rev. vi, 15-17. When he shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. 2 Thess. i, 7, 8.

Thus the intercessory work of our Saviour does not contemplate the conversion of the world as a finality, but it will close with the giving of his enemies into his possession, making them his footstool, or putting them under his feet. And he will come as King of kings and Lord of lords, (of the kings and lords of this world,) to destroy them and their armies. Rev. xix. Then instead of looking for a time of peace when the Lord has not said peace, it would be better to listen to the admonition to be wise, and serve the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Ps. ii, 10-12.

The proofs given in this chapter are plain and conclusive on this subject. We shall next examine the scriptures concerning the destruction of the nations, and see if we can harmonize the great

outlines of prophecy with these particular facts. If we do, we may safely say we have the truth; for the truth is where there is an agreement of general and particular declarations, of principles and facts, of premises and conclusions.

CHAPTER II.

NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE COMING JUDGMENTS.

The Saviour foretold the destruction of Jerusalem and her children, and declared it was because they knew not the time of her visitation. Luke xix, 41-44. By this we are to judge that they might have known the time. God never visits a nation, or an age in judgment without first warning them of the impending danger. So it was with the Antediluvians, the Sodomites, the Egyptians, the Ninevites, and the Jews. And by these examples we learn, also, that it is not necessary in these warnings that all become convinced of the danger; (for some will not believe;) but it has always been deemed sufficient in the development of God's plan, when those who tremble at his word, and are willing to believe, have been so fully warned that they might have an opportunity to escape. Such was the warning to Noah, to Lot, to the Hebrews, to the people of Nineveh, and to those Jews who believed the preaching of Christ and his apostles. The others of these several ages, having had the same warning, "knew not" till their destruction came upon them. There was no

necessity for the ignorance of Jerusalem, for God had spoken of the judgments to be visited upon sins such as hers, by all the prophets, beginning with Moses, who had forewarned them of these very things. See Matt. xxi, 33-45. Thus in all cases God's throne is clear, and they who sin, alone have to bear their iniquity.

Jerusalem might have known, and knowing, might have averted the impending judgment; for Jesus declared his willingness, yea, his desire, *often* to have gathered her children, but they rejected his offers of mercy. Matt. xxiii, 37. But there was one class who were especially guilty, and more than all others deserving of the wrath which fell upon that guilty nation; to wit, those who were instructed in the word of the Lord, but had "taken away the key of knowledge;" who would neither enter in themselves, nor suffer others who were willing to enter in. Luke xi, 52. Their guilt was like that of the watchman at whose hand the Lord will require the blood of those who fall unwarned. Eze. iii, 17-20.

Another destruction, great and terrible is spoken of in God's word; and it becomes all who have any regard for the word, and the salvation of themselves and their fellow-men, to inquire, against whom the threatenings are pronounced, and at what time they are to be executed. If these judgments be proclaimed, and yet it be not known whether they are near or far off; whether at the coming of Christ, or one thousand years subsequent to his coming; or whether the destruction will overtake few or many, the trumpet will then give an uncertain sound, and "who shall prepare himself to

the battle?" These different views are being proclaimed; and if the destruction will not take place till a long time after the coming of Christ, or if there be many that will escape that destruction, then those who proclaim the judgments of God as soon coming on "all flesh," or all the unrighteous of earth, are found "false witnesses of God." But if this latter view be true—if the wrath of God is speedily to be poured out on all the inhabitants of earth who are not "Christ's at his coming," then those who put afar off the evil day, or promise a way of escape other than that offered through repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, are taking away the key of knowledge, and at their hands will be required the blood of those who fall without a warning. Thus it is manifest that, in either case, it is important that we know "what is truth," and that, knowing, we faithfully proclaim it.

From all that is said in the Bible respecting the teachings of false prophets, we should be very careful to avoid crying, *Peace*, when the Lord has said, *There is no peace*. This has been the characteristic of false prophets in all ages, and is to be a prominent delusion in the last days. "For when they shall say, *Peace and safety*, then sudden destruction cometh upon them." There will be those in the last days who will cry *peace and safety*; but instead of *peace* there will be *war*, and instead of *safety* there will be a *snare*. Therefore Zion's watchmen are directed to "Sound an alarm in my holy mountain; let *all the inhabitants* of the land tremble; for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand." Joel ii, 1. The people are

summoned to hear this alarm as follows: "Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people; let the earth hear, and *all that is therein*; the world, and all things that come forth of it. For the indignation of the Lord is upon *all nations*, and his fury upon *all their armies*; he hath *utterly destroyed them*, he hath delivered them to the slaughter." Isa. xxxiv, 1, 2. This day is spoken of by all the prophets. Says one, "The great day of the Lord is near, it is near and hasteth greatly, even the voice of the day of the Lord: the mighty man shall cry there bitterly. That day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of *wasteness and desolation*, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness, a day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities, and against the high towers. And I will bring distress upon men, that they shall walk like blind men, because they have sinned against the Lord; and their blood shall be poured out as dust, and their flesh as the dung. Neither their silver nor their gold shall be able to deliver them in the day of the Lord's wrath; but the *whole land* shall be devoured by the fire of his jealousy; for he shall make even a speedy riddance of all them that dwell in the land." Zeph. i, 14-18. Again in the same book it is said: "My determination is to gather *the nations*, that I may assemble *the kingdoms*, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger; for *all the earth* shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy." Chap. iii, 8. Another Prophet says: "Howl ye; for the day of the Lord is at hand; it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty. Behold the day of

the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it." Isa. xiii, 6, 9. The Lord says by the same Prophet, "Behold the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste. The land shall be *utterly emptied and utterly spoiled*: for the Lord hath spoken this word." Chap xxiv, 1, 3. Jeremiah gives an account of this destruction more fully and emphatic than those already quoted. "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel unto me: Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it. And they shall drink and be moved, and be mad, because of the sword that I will send among them. Then took I the cup at the Lord's hand, and made all the nations to drink unto whom the Lord had sent me; to wit, Jerusalem, and the cities of Judah, and the kings thereof, and the princes thereof, to make them a desolation, an astonishment, an hissing, and a curse; as it is this day; Pharaoh king of Egypt, and his servants, and his princes, and all his people; and all the mingled people, and all the kings of the land of Uz, and all the kings of the land of the Philistines, and Ashkelon, and Azzah, and Ekron, and the remnant of Ashdod, Edom, and Moab, and the children of Ammon, and all the kings of Tyrus, and all the kings of Zidon, and the kings of the isles which are beyond the sea, Dedan, and Tema, and Buz, and all that are in the utmost corners, and all the kings of Arabia, and all the kings of the mingled people that dwell in the desert, and all the kings of Zimri, and all the kings of Elam, and all the kings of the Medes, and all

the kings of the north, far and near, one with another, *and all the kingdoms of the world, which are upon the face of the earth*: and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them. Therefore thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: drink ye, and be drunken, and spue, and fall, and rise no more, because of the sword which I will send among you. And it shall be, *if they refuse to take the cup at thy hand to drink*, Then shalt thou say unto them, *Thus saith the Lord of hosts*: YE SHALL CERTAINLY DRINK. For lo, I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and should ye be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished; for *I will call for a sword upon ALL THE INHABITANTS OF THE EARTH*, saith the Lord of hosts. Therefore prophesy thou against them all these words, and say unto them, The Lord shall roar from on high, and utter his voice from his holy habitation; and he shall mightily roar upon his habitation; he shall give a shout as they that tread the grapes, *against all the inhabitants of the earth*. A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations, *he will plead with all flesh*: he will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Behold evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth. And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth: they shall not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried, they shall be dung upon the ground." Jer. xxv, 15-33. It has been supposed

that some nations will escape, but such a supposition is here contradicted; the language is clear and definite—the destruction will be universal and utter; and that it will include the heathen, is plainly stated by the prophets. "Thus saith the Lord God; Howl ye, wo worth the day! For the day is near, even the day of the Lord is near, a cloudy day; it shall be the time of the heathen." Eze. xxx, 2, 3. Another Prophet says, "For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen." Obad. 15. And another, "Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles; prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up; beat your plow-shares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears: let the weak say I am strong. Assemble yourselves, and come, *all ye heathen*, and gather yourselves together round about; thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord. Let the heathen be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I sit to judge *all the heathen* round about. Joel iii, 9-12.

Now that there is to be, at some period of time, an utter destruction of all the inhabitants of the earth, no one who reads the prophecies can deny; and it is most evident that the scriptures here quoted plainly teach it. Had we the privilege of framing the testimony to our own liking, it would be impossible to present it in language more clear and emphatic. I will now notice a few points in these passages which will serve the twofold purpose of showing the identity of these with certain events spoken of in the New Testament, and of locating the chronology of these judgments, or fixing the time of their execution.

1. *This warning is given*—not because the day of the Lord is nearly expired, nor yet because it is come—but *because the day of the Lord is coming; it is near and hasteth greatly*; therefore the people are warned of those events which are to transpire when that day is ushered in. This alone is sufficient to show that these judgments are identical with those spoken of in Revelation, which will be inflicted in connection with the coming of the Son of man. See the promise to the Philadelphia church. "Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon *all the world*, to try them that dwell upon the earth. Behold I come quickly: hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." Rev. iii, 10, 11.

2. *The alarm is sounded when a great battle, or universal war, is pending.* It is said, in the time of the sixth plague, "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth to the *kings of the earth, and of the whole world*, to gather them to the battle of the great day of God Almighty." Again the warning is given in the next verse, "Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth." Rev. xvi, 13-15.

3. *They shall certainly drink*; even if they refuse, their refusal is of no avail—it is too late. This must be identical with the threatenings of the Third Angel's Message of Rev. xiv, 9-12, which refer to the plagues, (under which the battle occurs,) in which it is said they "shall drink of the

wine of the wrath of God which is poured out *without mixture* into the cup of his indignation." By comparing the scriptures, we find that Eze. ix, is a parallel to these, where an order is given to those who have the slaughter weapons: "Let not your eye spare, neither have ye pity. Slay utterly old and young, both maids, and little children, and women." Verses 5, 6. These all directly refer to the time when the Saviour ceases to plead with the Father in behalf of sinful men, and judgment without mercy is made manifest.

4. *The voice of God is heard from on high in the midst of these awful scenes.* In the description which I have quoted from the prophet Jeremiah it is said, "The Lord shall roar from on high, and utter his voice from his holy habitation; he shall mightily roar upon his habitation; he shall give a shout, as they that tread grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth." Jer. xxv, 30. Says John, "And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a *great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne*, saying, It is done." Rev. xvi, 17. When Joel foretold the gathering of "all nations," and "all the heathen," to the valley of Jehoshaphat, he added, "The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake." Joel iii, 15, 16. All will allow that the pouring out of the seventh vial or plague, when the voice of God is heard, is in immediate connection with the coming of Christ. The words of the Saviour are, "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall

the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and *the powers of the heavens shall be shaken*. And THEN shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven." Matt. xxiv, 29, 30. The Prophet says it is the voice of God from on high that shakes "the powers of the heavens," and with this agree the words of the Apostle: "For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh *from heaven*. Whose voice then shook the earth; but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only but also heaven." Heb. xii, 25, 26.

5. *When this destruction falls upon the world, God's people will be delivered.* It has been claimed that there are exceptions to these general declarations, which is only true if the righteous can be said to form an exceptional class. But I think the term is not strictly applicable—instead of their being exceptions to these declarations, they form a separate class to whom these declarations can in no wise apply. There are two, and only two, classes—the righteous and the wicked. The scriptures do not teach that there is a class between those who are under the law and those under grace; there can be no medium between condemnation and justification. I know of none who stand free from condemnation but those who are justified; and I can not conceive how any can be justified except through faith in Christ. See Rom. iii, v, and vi. And if vengeance be taken on "them that know not God, and that *obey not the gospel* of our Lord Jesus Christ," of course those only will escape who *know God and obey the gospel*.

When the Lord says "he will plead with all flesh," it is to "give *them that are wicked* to the sword." Jer. xxv, 31. He will "lay the land *desolate*: and he shall *destroy the sinners* thereof out of it." Isa. xiii, 9. Though the land be *desolate*, only the *sinners* will be destroyed. Again, when the earth is *utterly emptied*, "the inhabitants of the earth are burned and *few men left*." Isa. xxiv, 6. Who the *few men* are, may be learned from verses 13, 14: "When thus it shall be in the midst of the land among the people, there shall be as the shaking of an olive-tree, and as the gleaning-grapes when the vintage is done. THEY shall lift up their voice, THEY shall sing for the majesty of the Lord." The righteous will sing their triumph, as is shown in Rev. xv. These "few men" are not "left" upon the earth, else the earth would not be *made waste* and "*utterly emptied*," but they are left from the burning. The prophet Joel says, "The Lord shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem: and the heavens and the earth shall shake." Jeremiah says he shall shout against all the *inhabitants of the land*; and Joel adds, "But the Lord shall be the hope of *his people*, and the strength of the children of Israel." Daniel had a view of the same overthrow of the nations, and to him the angel said, "There shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and *at that time* thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." Dan. xii, 1. This is when Michael stands up or reigns. It is evident that this deliverance takes place at the coming of Christ,

and not at any subsequent time. Although there may be no dissent from this view, I will notice a few parallel texts from the New Testament. Says Paul, "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us, *when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God,*" &c. 2 Thess. i, 6-8. In his first epistle to the same church he offers words of comfort; that when the Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout, the righteous dead, them which sleep in Jesus, shall arise, and the living be changed, and all caught up together to meet the Lord in the air, and so ever be with him. He adds, "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them." 1 Thess. v, 1-3. With "the times and the seasons" of which he speaks, he has here inseparably connected certain events; to wit, the coming of the day of the Lord, the descent of the Lord himself, the resurrection of the righteous dead, the change of the living, their ascension to meet the Lord in the air, and the destruction of those who say, Peace and safety. At the coming of Christ the wheat and tares (righteous and wicked) are gathered, the first into the Lord's garner, the second into bundles to be burned. Matt. xiii, 24-30; also xxiv, 31; Rev. xiv, 19, 20. Many others might be noticed, but these are sufficient.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE NATIONS.

The second chapter of Daniel contains the outlines of this world's history from the time of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, about 600 years before Christ, till the setting up of God's everlasting kingdom, now near at hand. The image here presented is composed of four general divisions: the first, or head of gold, being a symbol of the kingdom of Babylon, of which Nebuchadnezzar, as reigning monarch, was the representative. In the interpretation of the dream Daniel said to him, "Thou, O king, art a king of kings; for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Dan. ii, 37, 38.

To Belshazzar, the Prophet said, "The Most High God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy father a kingdom, and majesty, and glory, and honor. And for the majesty that he gave him, all people, and nations, and languages, trembled and feared before him: whom he would he slew; and whom he would he kept alive: and whom he would he set up; and whom he would he put down." Chap. v, 18, 19. By this we are taught the universality of the kingdom of Babylon. Of course its successors were of the same extent; otherwise they could not have held the same dominion, and there would have been a break in the chain of argument which teaches the universality of God's everlasting king-

dom "under the whole heaven." The scripture is also positive on this point. By chapter v, we learn that the kingdom was divided, when Belshazzar was slain, and given to the Medes and Persians.

In chap. viii, the kingdom of Media and Persia is represented by the symbol of a ram having two horns. See verse 20. Of the ram the Prophet said: "I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great." Verse 4. This was the second or silver part of the image of chap. ii. Its successor is thus introduced: "And another *third kingdom*, of brass, *which shall bear rule over all the earth.*" Verse 39. This third kingdom is symbolized by the he-goat of chap. viii, 5-8, which is interpreted in verse 21, to be the king of Grecia. Of the goat Daniel said: "I saw him come close to the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns; and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him; and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand. Therefore the he-goat waxed *very great.*" Chap. viii, 7, 8.

The fourth division of the image was iron. The interpretation says: "And the *fourth kingdom* shall be *strong as iron*, forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise." Chap. ii, 40. The same in chap. viii,

is symbolized by the *little horn* that came forth of one of the four horns that came up on the he-goat; which signifies that from one of the divisions of the Grecian Empire, the *universal empire* of Rome came forth; for it is said the little horn waxed *exceeding great*. It is evident that this is a symbol of the Roman kingdom; for it can be no power inferior to the Medo-Persian or Grecian kingdoms; as the first was called *great*, the second *very great*, but this waxed *exceeding great*. This agrees with the prophecy of the second chapter which gives superior strength to the fourth division of the image—the iron.

Now that the Babylonian kingdom was universal is plainly shown by Daniel's expressions in chapters ii and v; that its successor, the kingdom of the Medes and Persians, was universal, is shown by chapters v and viii, as quoted; that the Grecian, which subdued and succeeded the Persian, was universal, is shown by chap. ii, 39, which says the third kingdom shall bear rule over all the earth; and by chapter viii, where it is symbolized by the he-goat; and that the *Roman* kingdom was universal, and therefore the power represented by the little horn which was exceeding great, is shown by Luke ii, 1: "There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that *all the world* should be taxed." As it was the successor of the Grecian, and the fourth in order of these universal monarchies, it was therefore the power represented by the iron of the image.

Again, this iron was subdivided into ten parts, or kingdoms, which is literally true of the Roman kingdom.

In the days of these (ten) kingdoms shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. The kingdom of God is the power which is to destroy or break in pieces all these kingdoms; this is symbolized in the dream by a *stone*. This kingdom is *first* to be set up; *second* to destroy *all* these kingdoms; and *third* to fill the whole earth.

Daniel's vision of chap. vii, covers the same ground as the dream of Nebuchadnezzar in chap. ii, and some additional facts concerning the divisions of the fourth kingdom. *Babylon* is represented by the *lion*—"the king of beasts"—as gold is more precious than the other metals. The *Medo-Persian* kingdom is represented by the *bear*. In chap. viii, the ram had two horns, (Medes and Persians,) but one was higher than the other, and the higher (Persian) came up last. Darius the Median took the kingdom on the death of Belshazzar. In this vision of chap. vii, the bear raised up itself on one side. Verse 5. The ram pushed westward, and northward, and southward; (to Babylon, Lybia, and Egypt.) The bear also had three ribs in its mouth. The Grecian kingdom is represented by a leopard, with four wings; the wings doubtless denoting its speedy conquest of the world; it had also four heads, as in chap. viii, the Grecian kingdom is said to be divided into four parts, symbolized by the four horns of the he-goat. The symbol of the Roman power is a nameless beast—"dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devour-

ed and break in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it; . . . and it had ten horns."

Verse 7.

Says the Prophet, "I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." Verse 8. Of this horn the interpretation says: "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand, until a time, and times, and the dividing of time." Verse 25. Says the vision: "I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away, yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time. Verses 11, 12. This does not mean that their lives were prolonged after the body of the fourth beast was destroyed; but their lives were prolonged after their dominion was taken away. The dominion of the lion was taken away when Belshazzar was slain, that of the bear was taken away when Alexander conquered the Persians; that of the leopard when the Romans established themselves masters of the world; the fourth or dreadful beast was to retain the dominion until his destruction. This of course will not conflict with Rev. xiii, where the beast is

said to receive a deadly wound, for the deadly wound *is healed*.

The fact recorded in Dan. vii, 12, is often lost sight of; and it seems to be taken for granted that their lives are taken away when their dominion is taken away; but as this vision corresponds with the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, this 12th verse must be considered to harmonize the vision with the 35th verse of chap. ii: "Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold *broken to pieces together*;" which could not be if the gold, silver and brass, were each in turn broken to pieces when its successor took the dominion.

These are termed Heathen or Gentile dominions, and the whole view presents a strong analogical argument for the universality of the everlasting kingdom to be set up by the God of heaven. "The kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom," is "under the whole heaven." Here "*the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven*," shows that the kingdom and dominion are equal, or of the same extent. The stone that smote the image is a symbol of the kingdom, and this stone (or kingdom) "*filled the whole earth*," not a part of it merely. The kingdoms of this prophecy bore rule over all the earth. So will the kingdom of God. They were universal—before them none could stand up—out of their hands none could deliver.

Now if these kingdoms were universal in extent, when they are destroyed, what kingdom or nation will be left, and where will it be? All that is ever claimed, or can be claimed, in regard to the

extent of these kingdoms, either to meet the demands of the scripture expressions quoted, or the analogy of the everlasting kingdom, I claim here in regard to the destruction of these kingdoms. If any could stand up before them, or resist their will, then may some hope to escape their destruction. But if any escape in the day of their destruction, then I claim that, by analogy, they will be beyond or outside the dominion and greatness of the kingdom which will be "under the whole heaven," for when this *stone* or kingdom destroys all these kingdoms, it will destroy all that exist on the territory which it will afterwards occupy. This is evident from the whole scope of the prophecy. This prophecy renders it certain that the Gentiles or Heathens will not escape in the day of destruction, as it is in respect to Gentile or Heathen dominions that it speaks.

But perhaps it may be said that there is another beast in prophecy not included in those dominions; to wit, the two-horned beast of Rev xiii;—that these four beasts comprized the kingdoms of the whole world, as known to the ancients, but the two-horned beast is a symbol of *American* power, and here is room for the escape of some from the destruction of those kingdoms. That the two-horned beast is a symbol of a power on the *Western Continent*, I firmly believe, but the conclusion that it may therefore escape the destruction spoken of in the prophecy of Daniel, I deny. I will now examine the scriptures on this point.

The "great red dragon" of Rev. xii, is well understood to be a symbol of the Roman empire in its Pagan form, and answers to the "dreadful and

terrible" beast of Dan. vii, as first seen by the Prophet. The seven-headed and ten-horned beast of Rev. xiii, is a symbol of the same dominion under Papal rule, and answers to the same beast of Daniel in another phase; namely, after the rise of the blasphemous, persecuting horn. The dragon gave the beast his power and seat and great authority. Here we have in Revelation the same universality of dominion presented as is given in Daniel; and to render assurance, if possible, more sure, that the same extent of dominion is possessed by the beast, it is shown as a *combination* of the four beasts of Daniel's vision. The lion's mouth, the bear's feet, the leopard's body, the seven heads and ten horns, all serve to show that it occupies the locality of those beasts. It has the characteristics of them all, and doubtless stands as the representative of them all. Then the two-horned beast is brought to view, working miracles in the sight of the first or ten-horned beast, and saying to them that dwell upon the earth that they should make an image to the beast, to which he has power to give life, and causes all to receive the mark of the beast and worship his image. Verses 11-16. By this descriptive work we may identify the two-horned beast in any place. In chap. xix, "The word of God" appears as "KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS," to "judge and make war." The issue is thus declared: "And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which

he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. THESE BOTH were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." Verses 19, 20.

There can but two *suppositions* arise which would avoid the conclusion here presented, and both are sometimes urged. Either a *remnant* are left in this great national destruction, or else this does not take place at the second advent. It is true that there is a remnant spoken of in this connection, but the Word says: "And the *remnant* WERE SLAIN with the sword of him that sat upon the horse." Verse 21.

To show that this occurs at the second advent of our Lord, I will present and compare a few scriptures. When this battle is about to take place, in which the beast and false prophet are slain, an angel calls to the fowls of heaven to come and "eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of *all men*, both free and bond, both small and great." Verse 18. As this occurs at the revelation of the Son of God and his victory over his enemies, it evidently synchronizes with Rev. vi, 16, 17—the *great day of the wrath of the Lamb*. The same classes are here presented: "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bond man, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains. Verse 15. This is under the opening of the *sixth seal*, previous to the seventh.

But we have the most positive testimony to of-

fer on this point, in the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians. Here the Apostle speaks of the same Papal Roman power that is in Rev. symbolized by the ten-horned beast, and gives it the several titles of "the man of sin," the "son of perdition," and the "wicked." He says, "then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall *destroy with the brightness of his coming.*"

I will now briefly sum up the points of the present argument sustained by the scriptures quoted:

1. The image of Dan. ii, presents in symbol the four universal monarchies of the world—Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.

2. The four beasts of Dan. vii, are symbols of the same kingdoms.

3. These kingdoms are all destroyed together.

4. The ten-horned beast of Rev. xiii, covers the same ground or locality that is covered by the four beasts of Daniel.

5. The ten-horned beast and the two-horned are destroyed together, or at the same time.

6. The ten-horned beast, (entitled the wicked,) will be destroyed at the coming of Christ. But with this is linked the fate of all the others.

Therefore, all the powers or kingdoms, represented by the symbols of beasts in Daniel and Revelation, will be destroyed at the second coming of Christ.

These in connection with the proof on the judgments of God in the day of the Lord, bring us to the plain conclusion that,

1. The Lord will destroy all the nations, and all

the inhabitants of the earth—his saints only excepted; and,

2. This destruction will take place in immediate connection with the second coming of Christ.

CHAPTER III.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

As long as men have "carnal minds" that are "not subject to the law of God," so long will doubts arise in regard to the revelation that he has made. And as long as prejudice is allowed to sway the mind, objections will arise in regard the plainest doctrines of the Word, even with those who regard the Scriptures as truth, and profess to abide by their decisions. Thus, on the doctrine of immortality alone through Christ, the truth is plainly taught—the general principles which ought to govern the investigation of that subject are easily defined; yet many refuse to bow to these principles, and cling to their construction of a single passage or sentence as if their conclusions and inferences were of more value than well-established truths.

The Universalists act on this principle, as well as many other existing sects, whose theories are built up on partial and one-sided views of scripture. I have heard professors of religion denominate certain passages of scripture, "Universalist texts," "Calvanistic texts," "Armenian texts," &c., as if Christ was divided, or God was the author of confusion; as if, foreseeing these several factions in the professed Christian world, he had made provision in his word for the accommodation of their tastes and

prejudices. *That view is true which harmonizes apparently conflicting declarations.* This must be admitted by all. I will illustrate this in noticing the first objection.

I consider the *main positions* of the theory of the Age to Come as mere objections to the great scripture truths presented in the foregoing chapter.

OBJECTION.—Rev. xxii, 2. “The leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.”

This text is offered in proof that mortal nations will live on the earth on probation, after Christ comes. I consider that one of two things is indispensable to sustain such a view; namely, either to show that the events of which I have spoken do not occur at the coming of Christ, or that I have misconstrued the testimony of the many scriptures I have quoted. But I think all must admit that I have shown their proper connection, and used them according to the plain, obvious import of their language. Hence the objector’s view of Rev. xxii, 2, must be incorrect. I will now show that it is in perfect harmony with the view that I have presented.

The objection assumes that the blessing of the above passage, and of the 14th verse, is not for the saints of this age, but for those who may become such in the age to come; for the saints will then have become immortal, and cannot need the tree of life; and they will not then be subject to sickness or disease, and therefore will not need healing.

If we were to be guided by the “enticing words of man’s wisdom,” we would acknowledge such reasoning; but the scriptures are our guide, and I

think an examination of them will convince us of the error of assuming a positive position on the strength of mere human reason, on a subject which we cannot fully comprehend.

The “seven churches” of Rev. ii and iii, were either seven literal churches in Asia, or they are seven different states of the church in as many different periods of time. The latter view is doubtless correct, but in either case they are before the coming of Christ, as in each of the four last letters that event is spoken of as being yet future. Of course the members of the “church at Ephesus”—the first of the seven—must come up in the resurrection, to receive their reward. The promise to that church is, “To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.” Rev. ii, 7. Here is a point that no sophistry can evade. If the blessing is for them, it may be for all the resurrected saints, and the changed also, even though the wisdom of the world be not able to comprehend all the depths of the counsels of God. To me the promise is precious; and I look forward with joy to the time when all those who keep the commandments may have right to the tree of life, and enter through the gates into the city.

Having now obtained a scripture application of this blessed promise, we are prepared to further examine the text. And the objection is further seen to be invalid in that the whole scene is laid on the new earth, (not in the “Age to Come,”) where there is neither death, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor pain; [chap. xxi, 4;] and in chap. xxii, where it says the leaves of the tree were for the

healing of the nations, the very next sentence reads, "*And there shall be no more curse.*" Verse 3. "Come now and let us reason together." Can sickness or disease exist where there is no more curse? And if, as is claimed, "the nations" will then be on probation, there must be, not only sickness, but also death; for we cannot suppose immortal men will be on probation; and if they were not subject to death, they would not, on the ground of the objection, need the tree of life, but in that respect be equal to the saints. To sustain this objection the text must be wrested from its obvious connection, or death be introduced into the new earth. But keeping in view the promise to the church of Ephesus, and looking at chap. xxi, 24, how plain it is that these nations are "the nations of THEM WHICH ARE SAVED," and not them *which are to be saved*, or which *may perhaps be saved*. These are the nations whose kings bring their glory and honor into the city, the New Jerusalem, which is the city here described.

I consider that the scriptures above noticed remove the objection, and prove that the idea of *healing diseases*, or *removing a curse*, is not implied in the text. To support this view I offer the definition of the word as given by Greenfield. The word rendered *healing*, is *therapeian*. That all may be assured on this point, I copy the following definitions from the lexicon.

Therapeia, service, attendance, aid, help, Lu. 9, 11, *by impl.*, relief, healing, cure, Re. 22, 2; *meton.*, those who render service, servants, domestics; family, household, Matt. 24, 45, Lu. 12, 42, *from*

Therapeuo, to serve, minister to, render service, and attendance, worship, Ac. 17, 25; *by impl.*, to heal, cure, Matt. 4, 23, 24; 8, 16, *et. al.*: whence, *Therapon*, a servant, minister.

The text teaches that the leaves of the tree are for the *use or service* of the nations; they being, as before shown, *saved* in the kingdom of God.

OBJECTION.—Isa. ix, 7. There is to be an *increase* of Messiah's government and peace, which supposes of necessity that it will spread and men yield obedience to it, which it would be inconsistent to suppose of the eternal state.

This objection has been urged by several writers; but it is *their view* of the text that is inconsistent with *their view* of the eternal state. How do they know there is to be an "eternal state" of Messiah's reign, except by the expressions which declare it? and how do they know the *order* of that state, except by the terms that define it? Now the objection involves a conclusion at variance with the terms of the very text on which it is based. The passage reads, Of the *increase* of his *government and peace* THERE SHALL BE NO END, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and TO ESTABLISH IT WITH JUDGMENT AND WITH JUSTICE, from henceforth, even FOREVER." If these terms do not point it out as an eternal state, I should be happy to be informed what language would be appropriate to the purpose; but I shall make further remarks on these terms in considering other objections.

OBJECTION.—2 Thess. i, 7-10. This text does not say that the Lord, when he comes, will take vengeance on *all* them that know not God, and *all*

that obey not the gospel; it speaks only in general terms, of course allowing of exceptions.

Those who use this text to prove the destruction of the wicked, would smile at an objection based upon it, against that view, having so much the appearance of caviling; and had not the objection been raised by those standing high in the esteem of many of their fellow men, it might be passed in silence. Though I would not think to prove any great doctrine by a single disconnected text, I think this is in harmony with what I have endeavored to show, namely, that all who are not "Christ's at his coming," are destroyed from off the earth. Let us see what it teaches. "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you, and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." We notice here the time when the Lord Jesus is revealed; the time when the saints will have rest; and they that trouble them will receive their recompense of tribulation, or vengeance. These are divided into two classes, (1.) them that know not God, and (2.) them that obey not the gospel. Now we have the *classes* disposed of at a *definite time*; let us look at other statements relative to the *same time* to get the *particulars* or *individuals*. "Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give *every man* according as his work shall be." Rev. xxii, 12. "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the *coming of the Son of man be*. For as in the days

that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not, until the flood came and took them *all* away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

Matt. xxiv, 37, 39. "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and *destroyed them all: even thus shall it be* in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Luke xvii, 28-30. Thus, not only the classes are destroyed in that day, but EVERY MAN—ALL OF THEM; and this testimony removes more than this objection; it removes the objector's *whole ground of argument*, so that all other objections are really cut off by it.

OBJECTION.—Rev. v, 9, 10. The saints reign as kings on the earth; but they do not reign over one another, hence there must be mortal men or nations over whom they reign.

This is an inference altogether unwarranted, and at variance with the scriptures. We have seen by Rev. xxi, that on the new earth there are kings over the nations of them which are saved, who bring their glory and honor into the heavenly city—the new Jerusalem. In chap. xxii, in finishing up the description of the city wherein is the tree of life, and the river of water of life, and the throne of God and of the Lamb, where the Lord God gives his people light, the angel said, "*And they shall reign forever and ever.*" Verse v. Is not the conclusion equally legitimate that mortal men or nations will exist on the new earth for ev-

er and ever? In these and many other objections (and arguments for the Age to Come) the scriptures are wrested from their connection, and made to bow to a system of human reasoning as dangerous as it is erroneous. O that men would "cease to pervert the right ways of God," and let their feeble reason bow to the revelations of his all-wise counsels!

Other points in the text in question I reserve to be noticed in the future.

OBJECTION.—Heb, viii, 8–12. The New Covenant, embracing forgiveness of sins, is to be made with the house of Israel and Judah. This has not yet been done; for the scripture from which the text is quoted, [Jer. xxxi,] says, "They shall not cease from being a nation before me forever," but they are yet rejected and scattered. Hence it must be in the Age to Come. (See *Age to Come* by J. Marsh, pp. 107–109.)

Of all the perversions of scripture consequent upon a belief in that theory, this appears the most glaring and the most fatal. If the new covenant, with Christ the High Priest as its Mediator, his blood that ratified it and rendered forgiveness possible, its blessings to those who avail themselves of its intercessions; if these be removed from our reach and all transferred to the Age to Come, then truly may the gospel believer say, as did weeping Mary, "They have taken away my Lord." In the work above quoted, eight reasons are given why it must be made in the Age to Come, and exclusively with the natural descendants of Jacob. Before going into an examination of these points, I would call attention to a few facts set forth in the scriptures:

1. There are but two covenants contrasted—the old and the new.

2. The first was taken away and the new established by Christ. Heb. x, 1–22.

3. There are two (and only two) orders of priesthood—the Aaronic and Melchisedec.

4. There are two sanctuaries for the priests to officiate in—one on earth made by man, [Ex. xxv, 1–9,] the other in heaven, built by the Lord. Heb. viii, 1, 2.

5. They cannot change places of ministration, for under the first, or on earth, the Mediator of the new could not minister, [Heb. vii, 13–17; viii, 1–4,] and under the second or new, there is but "one mediator," [1 Tim. ii. 5,] which excludes all those of the first order.

6. No sin was taken away by the first, but forgiveness is granted under the second: therefore,

7. The old typified the new, [Heb. viii, 1–5,] and the minister of the new mediates for the transgressions under the old. Chap. ix, 15.

8. Under the old, offerings were made daily, [Heb. ix, 6, 7; x, 1–4,] but under the new, only one offering was made, and that but once. Chap. xi 10, 12.

9. Under the old the priests entered the sanctuary on earth with the blood of others; [Heb. ix, 25;] but under the new, Christ enters the heavenly by his own blood. Verses 11, 12.

10. Under the old, one priest succeeded another, but the Mediator of the new has no successor. Heb. vii, 23, 24.

I hope all will bear in mind these plain scripture facts, not only for their bearing on this objection, but on others that may be noticed.

That this covenant was to be made with Israel and Judah, I acknowledge, for it is so written; that it is to be made in the Age to Come, I deny, and that it belongs *only* to Israel and Judah, I deny, and shall now test these assertions by the Word.

The angel told the prophet Daniel, "Seventy weeks are cut off [from the 2300 days] upon *thy people*." This must be understood of Israel and Judah, who were to fall from their pre-eminence above the nations at the end of that time. Of the Messiah the angel said, "He shall confirm the (a—margin) covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." Dan. ix, 24, 27. The last week of the seventy determined or cut off upon that people, commenced at the commencement of Christ's preaching, was half expired at his crucifixion, and terminated at the time the apostles turned to the Gentiles. *This whole week belonged to them.*

In fulfillment of this prophecy, at the end of 69 weeks Messiah commenced preaching the gospel of the kingdom by saying, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Matt. xv, 24. He sent forth the twelve to preach the same gospel of the kingdom, to whom he said, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not." Chap. x, 6-8. After his resurrection he commissioned his disciples to preach the gospel, "beginning at Jerusalem." Luke xxiv, 47. This they did, tarrying at Jerusalem till they had received the Holy Spirit of promise, and they went forth preaching

to their brethren in all parts. Afterwards when the Jews contradicted and blasphemed, Paul and Barnabas said to them, "It was NECESSARY that the word of God should *first* have been spoken to you." Acts xiii, 46.

We cannot believe that salvation was more necessary for the Jew than the Gentile, or that either Jew or Gentile could be saved without the gospel of the kingdom; hence this *necessity* was because the prophecy and promise of God must be fulfilled. Peter said to them at Jerusalem, in the temple, "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, "And in thy seed shall *all the kindreds* of the earth be blessed. *Unto you first*, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Acts iii, 25, 26. Paul said of them, "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption; and the glory *and the covenants*, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and *the promises*." Rom. ix, 4. Also the text which is quoted from Jer. xxxi, is an extract from a letter which Paul wrote to his *Hebrew* brethren, in which he says, "We have such an High Priest," speaking of the covenant as being then established with them, in contrast with the *first covenant* which had ceased; and not only for them, but also for their brethren who had transgressed under the first covenant, was he ministering under the new. Heb. ix, 15.

If all this does not show that the new covenant was made with Israel, I do not know what could be said or done to show it. Can any Israelite rise

up in the face of these facts and say that God has not fulfilled his promise? And can any one have any intelligent idea of Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, chapters vii-x inclusive, who supposes that this covenant has not been made?

It is next asserted that it cannot refer to the Gentiles, but to Israel and Judah.

That Israel and Judah are distinct from the Gentiles, I also admit; otherwise we could conceive of no possible *necessity* of confirming the covenant with one before another; but that it belongs exclusively to one, or now *more to one than another*, I deny. (See *Age to Come*, p. 107, paragraph marked 6.) The scriptures from which I have quoted to show that it was made with Judah and Israel, also show that it was to extend to others as well as them. Thus when Christ commissioned his apostles he said that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name AMONG ALL NATIONS, *beginning at Jerusalem.*" Luke xxiv, 47. If this covenant had not been made with them, and the gospel first preached to them, the scriptures could not have been fulfilled; neither could they have been fulfilled *if it had been confined to them.* See again Acts xiii, 46, 47. "It was *necessary* that the word of God should FIRST have been spoken to you, but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles, *for so hath the Lord commanded us*, saying, "I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation to the ends of the earth." See Isa. xlii, 6.

But it may be asked, Can these promises of

the new covenant be said to be fulfilled by the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom to them seven years, and then taking it from them and preaching it to the Gentiles eighteen hundred years?

To this I reply, *the gospel was not taken from them, but they put it from themselves.* See again Acts xiii, 46. And from that day to this it has been preached to them—to all of them that would hear it, as well as to the Gentiles. When Paul says, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," we argue truly that "whosoever" includes Gentiles, but will "whosoever" exclude Israelites?

But it is said this is the Gentile dispensation, and the new covenant supposes a time when the Israelites will be restored to their former state of national pre-eminence.

This is erroneous in two respects: the terms of the covenant imply no such thing, nor do the scriptures which speak on this subject. Paul in his epistle to the Romans, recognizes the salvation of those only who embrace Christ by faith; of course it is a personal or individual salvation—the same that is offered to the Gentiles or "unnatural branches;" for in respect to the promises of God "there is no difference." Nor can this with any propriety be called the "Gentile dispensation," for the Gentiles were never made *exclusive* or even *pre-eminent* heirs of the promises of God under this or any other dispensation.

The Jews had a pre-eminence even in this dispensation, so that the promises of the new covenant or gospel were termed theirs, but the middle

wall of partition was broken down—the difference abolished, and it was henceforth ordained that the “Gentiles should be *fellow-heirs*, and of the *same body*.” Eph. iii, 6. What this body was, may be learned from the preceding chapter, where the Gentiles are said to have been in the time past “*aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise*.” “But now,” says the Apostle, “In Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes WERE FAR OFF, are MADE NIGH by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace who hath made BOTH ONE, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, . . . for to *make in himself of twain one new man*, so making peace, and that he might reconcile both unto God in *one body* by the cross. . . . Now therefore ye [Gentiles] are NO MORE STRANGERS AND FOREIGNERS, [from the *commonwealth of Israel*,] but FELLOW-CITIZENS with the saints and of the household of God.” Eph. ii, 12–19.

Jesus himself testified the same thing when he said to the Jews, “And other sheep I have which are *not of this fold*; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be ONE FOLD AND ONE SHEPHERD.” John x, 16. Here is a *unity of the flock* which should not be lost sight of; even as the Saviour prayed for them that should believe on him, “*that they all may be one*.” John xvii, 21.

Again, these promises have not failed, as the apostle Paul shows in Rom. ix. He speaks of his “kinsmen according to the flesh,” [verse 3,] and declares that the covenants and promises pertain to them, [verse 4,] and then seems to antic-

ipate the very objection stated; for he says, “*Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect*,” [verse 6,] although the “effect” may be denied by unbelievers, because all of Paul’s “kinsmen according to the flesh” are not converted; but the reason he assigns is, “*For they are not all Israel which are of Israel*,” that is to say, the covenant has been made with Judah and Israel according to the promise, and its rejection by the unbelieving children of Abraham does not make void the word of promise; for such are *not recognized as Israel*; (though they are “of Israel;”) and consequently have no *part in the promise*. From these facts it is very clear that “God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him.”

But we may go further. This equality not only exists—the effect is not only produced, but we have the *agency* and the *means* by which it is produced. Paul declares that the Gentiles are fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise *in Christ by the gospel*. Eph. iii, 6. Thus the gospel of Christ produces a union of Jew and Gentile and it is effected by his “having abolished in his flesh the law of commandments contained in ordinances: for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace.” Chap. ii, 15.

As long as the law of commandments contained in ordinances existed, so long was a distinction recognized between Jew and Gentile; the middle wall was broken down and both are made one; “For there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is

neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: [in the purposes or promises of God:] for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. iii, 28. Paul's rebuke to Peter has a bearing on this point. Peter was virtually acknowledging the distinction as yet existing, by conforming to that which had marked such a distinction; but Paul says, "*If I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.*" Chap. ii, 18.

In this we notice that (1.) The *gospel* had broken down the middle wall between Jews and Gentiles, and made both one, partakers of the same promises; and (2.) He who would build up this wall, and thereby separate between the partakers of the promises are transgressors against the *gospel*.

Let all beware how they undertake to build a middle wall which the *gospel* of Christ has abolished, or endeavor to divide the fold, when the Lord Jesus has said there shall be one fold and one Shepherd.

The old covenant with its ordinances (a sign of enmity and difference) has passed away, and now as there is one God, even so there is one Mediator, and one covenant under which he ministers, and one offering by which we are sanctified, and one flock which he has purchased, and one fold which he has prepared, that we may all be gathered in one body, by one spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling. Wherefore let us all strive for the unity of the faith, and keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Amen.

CHAPTER IV.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

OBJECTION.—Isa. liv, 1-10. The expressions in this chapter cannot refer to the New Jerusalem; the same that has been forsaken, desolate, &c., is to be built up in the future age. (See *Age to Come*, by J. Marsh, pp. 66, 67.)

This objection would have some degree of plausibility in its appearance, were it not that Paul has settled it otherwise, by applying it to the New Jerusalem, in his letter to the Galatians. A few words of divinely inspired comment are worth volumes of human reasoning, or human wisdom. There are many scriptures bearing on this point, serving to throw light on the expressions of the Apostle. In Matt. xxv, is a parable of a wedding: the cry is made, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh!" See Mal. iii, 1-3.

In Rev. xxi, we are told that the bride is the New Jerusalem; of course the saints will be the guests at the marriage supper. Compare Rev. xix, 7-9, with Luke xii, 32-37. This (midnight) cry was made in 1844, at the termination of the 2300 days of Dan. viii, 14, when Jesus went into the Most Holy Place of the Sanctuary in heaven, before the Ancient of days, to receive his kingdom and dominion. Compare Dan. vii, 9-14, with Rev. xi, 15-19.

The bride—the city—is the capital of the kingdom which he is there to receive; and his receiving the kingdom, (which must be before his return,) is identical with the marriage. Before the

marriage, Paul makes an application of Isa. liv, to the New Jerusalem; and it is evident that old Jerusalem was called the "married wife" in the days of Isaiah, or of the writing of this prophecy. Says the Apostle, "So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free." Gal. iv, 31. Yet this free woman, whose children we are by adoption, was desolate, or unmarried, and so continued at least till A. D. 1844, or till the marriage is fully consummated, which must be after that date. Those who bear these facts in mind, and consider Paul's argument in Hebrews, showing that the Sanctuary in the temple of heaven was defiled and needed to be purified or cleansed from sin, can have no difficulty in allowing all that these scriptures say of the New Jerusalem.

There are those that stumble on many subjects by not bearing in mind the apparent interchange of expressions in reference to type and antitype. Thus in Dan. viii, it was said that the Sanctuary should be cleansed at the end of 2300 days; and afterwards in explaining the same vision, in chap. ix, the angel without any qualification of terms, predicted the destruction of the city and the sanctuary, which was literally fulfilled long before the 2300 days terminated! Will not the sanctuary have to be "rebuilt," and some son of Aaron (for no others could minister there) have to come up to cleanse it at the end of the days? So we should suppose, if we treated this subject as many others are treated, leaving out of sight the New-Testament testimony, which shows that there were two sanctuaries, and points out their relation to these prophecies. So the New Testa-

ment informs us there are two Jerusalems, and we must bow to the decision of the scripture which shows their condition, and their relation to the prophecies, and to each other.

But if these expressions be allowed to refer to the present or old Jerusalem, then of course that will be the capital of the kingdom in the age to come; and her children—her seed—must be the saints who will inhabit her, and all who shall become such in that age. The question then arises, What will become of it at the termination of that age? This is an important question, as its settlement has a bearing on our title to the inheritance; and but two suppositions can arise in regard to it; namely, it will be burned up at the end of 1000 years, with the other works that are in the world; or, it will forever continue to exist in connection with the New Jerusalem. In regard to the first supposition, it would seem improbable that the capital of Christ's kingdom should ever be burned up; and if it was so to be, then Isa. liv, (and a great many other scriptures quoted as parallels by the advocates of the age to come,) will not apply. It says; "For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercy will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee." Allowing the advent to be as soon as 1866, where some Protestant writers begin the millennium, and dating the little wrath at the destruction of Jerusalem, in A. D. 70, the *little moment* will be one thousand seven hundred and ninety-six years, and the EVERLASTING kindness, extend through one thousand years! The *little*

wrath would be its overthrow, and treading down by the Gentiles, and the *great mercy* end in its being burned up by the fire which comes down from God out of heaven!

But the advocates of the age to come may say they do not believe any such absurdity. Of course, then, they believe it will stand forever, together with the New Jerusalem. Let us see how this will agree with the scriptures. Those who inhabit her, or are gathered to her after being rebuilt, would doubtless be her children, her seed, referred to in the text. Now let Paul's reasoning be applied to this view. He makes Agar, the bond-maid, the covenant from mount Sinai in Arabia, answer to "Jerusalem which now is," so that what the scripture says of the free and bond-woman, he applies to the two Jerusalems, the old and the new and there are no other Jerusalems but these two to which these expressions can apply. Now the advocates of the age to come argue as if the scripture said: Release the bond-woman and her son, for the son of the bond-woman shall take the precedence of the son of the free-woman! But "what saith the scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son, for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman." I pray that the Lord will deliver me from ever being gathered to Jerusalem which now is with her children, for so sure as the scripture is true, she with her children will be cast out when the New Jerusalem and her children come to take the inheritance.

Jesus would have gathered the children of Jerusalem, but she "would not;" and for all her sins

the curse of God came upon her. She has been the "married wife"—God's name was named on her—his tabernacle was there; but for her adulterous actions especially with the Romans, she was cast off and utterly rejected. After about 1800 years her bonded children apply to Christ to receive her again, and come and reign in her; but alas for her hopes and theirs: when he comes they find that *he has another Bride!* and the scripture demands that the adulterous woman and her bonded children be cast out. The glorious bride of our glorified Lord is the New Jerusalem. None but the "little flock" fully recognize this fact, and they are "waiting" for him to "return from the wedding." They know that the marriage is to be consummated in heaven, and patiently wait for their Lord to come to take them to the city, where they will be permitted to sit down at the "marriage supper of the Lamb." Then will the prophets be confounded "which see visions of peace for Jerusalem, and there is no peace, saith the Lord God." Eze. xiii.

OBJECTION.—Christ is a priest after the order of Melchisedec; but Melchisedec was both a priest and king at the same time: therefore the priesthood of Christ will not cease at his coming, but will continue while he is a king on the throne of David.

Paul to the Hebrews says the earthly priests "serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things;" [chap. viii, 5;] but there were certain things which were not exemplified by the priests of the order of Aaron, and there were other things in their ministration to which there is noth-

ing corresponding in the antitype. Therefore it is evident that Aaron and his sons, or the priests of that order, were not complete types of the Minister of the new covenant in the heavenly Sanctuary. They offered a multitude of offerings "year by year;" but he offered but one. Heb. vii, 27; ix, 25, 26; x, 1, 11, 12. Some have endeavored to follow the types so strictly that they have lost sight of this fact, and imbibed opinions subversive of some of the most important truths on this great subject. The points of difference in the ministration of the two orders are specified by the Apostle in his letter to the Hebrews. They could not continue by reason of death; but he ever liveth to make intercession for us. With them the priesthood descended from father to son; his is unchangeable. Heb. vii, 23-25. The reckoning of their genealogy was essential to their being admitted to discharge the duties of their office; but no priests were reckoned of the tribe from which he sprang. Chap. vii, 13, 14. They did not unite royalty with their priesthood; but he is both King and Priest.

As Aaron could not typify the character and priesthood of Christ in these respects, Melchisedec is presented in the scriptures to make up the deficiency. Says Paul, "For this Melchisedec, King of Salem, Priest of the Most High God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is King of peace; without father, without mother, without descent, having neither

beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a Priest continually." Heb. vii, 1-3. The record in Genesis would give us to understand that Melchisedec was a real personage, as much as Abraham who gave tithes to him; and he can only be said to have been without parents, descent, &c., as contrasted with Aaron and his sons, whose genealogy had to be carefully preserved, otherwise they were not permitted to fill the priestly office. That this method of expression was common among the Hebrews, who were very careful in preserving such records, we have the very best authority to show. Says Dr. Clarke, "He who could not support his pretensions by just genealogical evidence, was said by the Jews to be without father. . . . This sort of phraseology was not uncommon when the genealogy of a person was unknown or obscure.*

Now the record in Genesis gives us no information in regard to Melchisedec, further than that he

*The *Syriac* N. T. translates Heb. vii, 3, as follows: "Of whom neither his father nor his mother are written in the genealogies; nor the commencement of his days nor the end of his life, but, after the likeness of the Son of God, his priesthood remaineth forever.

Wakefield translates: "Whose name Melchisedec, meaneth king of righteousness; and king of Salem is king of peace: of whose father, mother, pedigree, birth and death, there is no account," &c.

The *Rheimish* N. T. has the following note: "Without father, &c. Not that he had no father, &c., but that neither his father, nor his pedigree, nor his birth, nor his death, are set down in the Scriptures."

Comprehensive Commentary. "The commentators generally agree that what is meant is, that his name was not preserved, or the names of his parents, in the sacred genealogies."

was king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God. Many have conjectured relative to the identity of Melchisedec, and some suppose he was Shem; but all such conjectures must be vain and fruitless, as it is evidently the design of the Author of the Scriptures that it should not be known. If it were possible to ascertain who Melchisedec was, further than the simple statement of Gen. xiv, 18, he would no longer stand a type of Christ's priesthood according to the declaration of Heb. vii, 1-3. All the conditions specified in that scripture regarding Melchisedec are fulfilled in the priesthood of Christ in the heavenly Sanctuary, *and no where else*. He has neither father nor son; that is, he has neither predecessor nor successor *in that office*; for it is in regard to his priesthood that these terms are applied. He has neither beginning of days nor end of life; that is, his office did not come to him because he was born of a certain line—it was not of lineal descent; neither does death cause a cessation of his ministry, as was the case with all of Aaron's order.

But the particular point at which the objection aims is that of his *kingly priesthood*. We have seen that all the other points specified in the type of Melchisedec apply to the ministry of Christ, at this present time, where he is officiating even in "heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." And is this point an exception? I think not, for several reasons. In the argument of the Apostle to the Hebrews he proves that Christ is superior to Aaron, constituted a priest by the oath of God after the order of Melchisedec. He points out the characteristics of his priesthood,

including its royalty, and sums up in chap. viii, 1, thus: "Now of the things which we have spoken"—concerning the priesthood of Christ—"this is the sum: *We have SUCH AN HIGH PRIEST*"—What kind of a High Priest? *Such a High Priest* as has been described; to wit, a priest who is holy, harmless and undefiled; not subject to death; whose priesthood is unchangeable; not of the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedec—King of Peace, and Priest of the Most High God. And where have we *such a High Priest*? on the throne of David? Let the Apostle answer:—"Who is set on the right hand of the Majesty *in the heavens*." He goes on to teach that the heavenly Sanctuary, where Christ ministers, must be purified with blood; also that he makes but one offering; that he offers it but once; and enters once into the perfect tabernacle to make an atonement. From these facts it is evident that the atonement must be fully made when he leaves, or ceases to minister in, "the Sanctuary and true tabernacle;" and not a declaration of the whole argument will admit of his performing this work a *second time in heaven, or resuming it somewhere else*. The above statements of Paul relating to the Melchisedec order of priesthood, are general; and as generals comprehend the sum of the particulars unless exceptions are directly granted, each particular must be included in the summing up of the argument, as no exception is noticed.

But again, the scriptures prove that that particular specification is now fulfilled by the Minister of the new covenant in heaven. See Zech. vi, 12, 13, which has been quoted (I might say perverted)

to prove that Christ will be a priest on the throne of David. It reads, "Behold the man whose name is the **BRANCH**; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the **LORD**; even he shall build the temple of the **LORD**; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.

It is altogether impossible to make this scripture apply to the reign of Christ on the throne of David. It will be perceived at a glance that two persons are introduced by the prophet: the Branch, which is Christ, the Son of God, and the **LORD**, or Jehovah. The Father and the Son. Now if we substitute these names for the pronouns in verse 13, it will read, "And the Son shall build the temple of the Father; and the Son shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon the Father's throne; and the Son shall be a priest upon the Father's throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between *them both*;" that is, between the Father and the Son. This scripture is fulfilled in the position of our Melchisedec priest, "who is set down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." Jesus himself testifies to his position in Rev. iii, 21, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Some will, perhaps, be ready to start in astonishment at the idea that Christ is a King at this present time, and has been during his whole ministry in heaven. But the word of God clearly teaches it, and therefore I believe it.

Not on the throne of David, in the kingdom of Israel, (which is cast down during his priesthood,) but on the throne of God, in the kingdom of the universe. We are taught that if we suffer with Christ, we shall also reign with him; and Jesus promises a seat on his throne to the overcomers. Then if we reign as kings with Christ, sitting upon his throne, is it too much to believe that Christ reigns as a King with the Father, while sitting on the Father's throne? It may be contrary to our ideas of Christ's position during the present dispensation, but if our ideas conflict with such plain teachings of scripture, let them be discarded at once. The word says he shall rule and be a priest on the throne of the **LORD**; and as the *counsel of peace* is "*between them both*" during his *priestly rule*, therefore he is at once "**KING OF PEACE, AND PRIEST OF THE MOST HIGH GOD.**" When I read the words of the risen Saviour to his disciples, that *all power in heaven and in earth* is given to him; [Matt. xxviii, 18;] that men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father; [John v, 23;] and learn that the Father hath *highly exalted* him, even to a seat on his own universal throne, my soul rejoices at the thought that "we have *such* a High Priest" to make intercession for us. Surely they that put their trust in such a Saviour shall not be ashamed.

It is greatly to be feared that we have not considered "the Apostle and High Priest of our profession," in all respects, in the light in which he is presented in the word. It is necessary that we recognize his exalted position, in order that we give him that honor which the Father requires

we should bestow upon the Son while in the joint occupancy of the throne of universal dominion.

Another point claims our attention, which is this: As Christ is a royal priest, or king and priest at once, these offices being united in Melchisedec, it is necessary to fulfill the type of Melchisedec that there be *no genealogical reckoning in regard to either his priesthood or kingship*. We should search in vain to find who was king before Melchisedec, or who succeeded him, or from whom he as king descended. What is applicable to him as priest, is true of him also as king. And so it is with Christ *in regard to that kingship which is united with his priesthood*. He is exalted to the throne of God, not by right of descent, but to fulfill his priestly work there, in which descent was not reckoned. And he is the "one Mediator," having neither predecessor nor successor in that office, so he is the only one that ever will enjoy the high privilege of sharing the power and honors of the throne of the Most High. This fact alone would render it certain that Christ's kingly priesthood is not upon his own throne, or on the throne of Israel, for when he takes that throne it is *as the Son of David*; and it is as necessary that his genealogy be traced to David in order for him to occupy that throne, as it was for the sons of Aaron to prove their descent from Levi, or from Aaron, in order to be permitted to minister in the sanctuary on earth. The objection urged on the priesthood of Christ, is clearly invalid. A correct understanding of his priestly work confirms the view that every case is decided at, or before, his coming; and that his saints will be redeemed, and

his enemies, including all the unredeemed, will be "dashed in pieces" at that time.

OBJECTION.—1 Cor. xv, 23-28. Christ will reign until he subdues his enemies, or puts them under his feet; in Rev. xx, this reign is declared to be 1000 years in duration, from which it is evident that his enemies will not be put under his feet until (or near) the close of the 1000 years; and of course are not all destroyed at his coming.

It can hardly be expected that in stating an objection of so much weight and importance as the above, in such a brief manner, the various views of the believers in the Age to Come should be fully brought out. But to make up for any deficiency in that respect, and to show that I have not misstated their views, I will quote from some of their writings. Rev. xx, 4-6, is invariably used in connection with 1 Cor. xv, as I have stated it above; and it is of the utmost importance to that theory that the events of the latter text be located in the 1000 years of the former. But their connection is merely taken for granted—it has not been, and cannot be, shown. This method of throwing texts together for effect, without showing an evident connection, is quite common with the advocates of that theory. As an instance, a lecturer once quoted Rev. xx, 6, and v, 10, in such close connection, that some of his hearers supposed that he had actually read from the Bible, "they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years on the earth." If the question was, a thousand years on the earth, or, not at all on the earth, the first proposition would have the argument, of course; but when, instead

of the latter statement we have it, *on the earth forever and ever*, it makes a material difference.

LET IT BE NOTICED: We never have denied the reign of Christ and his saints on the earth. On the contrary, we contend for an everlasting reign on the earth, when it is fitted for the inheritance of the saints. And when it is considered that the promise of the inheritance does not embrace the old earth, but the earth renewed, and that the saints shall possess it, and dwell therein forever, the very fact that a period of 1000 years is given as preceding that eternal reign, and the "redemption of the purchased possession," is strong presumptive evidence that the 1000 years' reign is not where the eternal reign is, to wit, on the earth.

J. Marsh, in his pamphlet on the Age to Come, pp. 31, 32, after quoting 1 Cor. xv, 23-28, remarks:

"The particular points in these passages to which we would now call especial attention, are the commencement, close, and character of the reign of Christ.

"1. His reign commences at his coming.

"2. It will continue until his enemies are subdued, or destroyed, the last of which is death.

"3. One grand object of that reign is to subdue or destroy his enemies.

"These points are clear and most conclusively proved by the evidence in the case. The number of years between the commencement and close of this reign, Paul does not tell, but John does. He gives us to understand that it will be a thousand years. Rev. xx.

"Verse 7. And when the thousand years are ex-

pired, Satan shall be loosed—of whom it is said in the 2d and 3d verses, that he was bound a thousand years, that he should not deceive the nations for that length of time, and verse 14 gives us to understand that when the thousand years close, 'death, the last enemy' will be destroyed. For death and hell are then 'cast into the lake of fire,' which is 'the second death.'

"The fair conclusion from the testimony of Paul and John, is, that the reign of Christ, when his enemies will be subdued, will be a thousand years. And as this reign commences at the coming of Christ, and as the 'times of restitution,' or 'dispensation of the fullness of times' also begin then, it is certain that those times, or that dispensation, will be of a thousand years duration. This will be the times of refreshing—'the times of restitution'—'his times'—'the dispensation of the fullness of time'—'the reign of Christ a thousand years,' or his millennial reign on the earth.

"Here we might rest the case, without offering any further evidence, feeling assured that we have fully proved our position."

J. M. Stephenson, in his work on the atonement, closely follows Mr. Marsh in his comment on this text. I will quote from him, and then notice both together. On pp. 83, 84, he says:

"With this view we may learn how long a period will be occupied by Jesus Christ in removing all the obstacles out of the way of man's salvation, and bringing back this revolted province into allegiance to the throne of his Father. Read 1 Cor. xv, 23-28. 'But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his

coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, all authority, and power; for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.'

"Here his reign commences with 'his coming,' and the resurrection of 'them that are his,' and terminates, as independent king, with the destruction of "the last enemy"—death. By Rev. xx, 5, 6, we learn that 'the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished;' that then 'the second death' is to have 'power' over them and they will be devoured.' Verse 9. Then the Son, having reigned until he has put all enemies under his feet, 'delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father,' and becomes subject himself, that the Father 'may be all in all;' that is, that the Father may be supreme, and the Son subordinate king under him. These are 'the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began.'"

I do not know that either of the above writers would endorse the last conclusion I have stated in the objection; viz., that the enemies of Christ will not be destroyed at his coming. Perhaps they may agree that all such as have developed characters as his enemies will be destroyed at his coming; while others, undeveloped, will be put on a new probation. But there are others, to my knowledge, who do not think that his enemies will be destroyed at that time. I heard one argue thus: "Christ receives the dominion before he comes to earth; and the object of his receiving it is stated, that all peo-

ple, nations and languages should serve and obey him." Dan. vii, 13, 14. Then the identical nations that are given to him, which are, of course, those existing on the earth at the time of the gift or of his coming, must serve him, to carry out the object of the gift, which they could not do if he destroyed them at his coming. The "Age to Come" presents itself before us in many forms and shapes, and we must meet it as it comes from the hands of its various exponents.

Against the views inculcated by the extracts I have quoted, I have several objections to offer, based upon the literal reading of the very scripture in question; and upon others explanatory of it, and harmonizing with it. As Elder Marsh draws an argument from it of sufficient weight, in his opinion, to prove the whole ground, and settle the whole question, it will become me to notice it with care, even though it be at some length. In noticing the unscriptural positions taken by the above writers, I shall show that,

1. "*The end*" is an expression used in the New Testament to denote the time of Christ's coming. In every other instance, with only one exception, when it is used without a direct qualification, the context shows that it refers to the end of this age, or the coming of Christ. In the exceptional instance, [John xiii, 1,] the context clearly shows the sense of its use. In the other, or qualified texts, it is generally associated with *the world* or *age*, and mostly refers to the end of the present age. It is in no place in the New Testament used to express the termination of any period beyond the present age, and a careful examination of this text

must convince all that it forms no exception to such a declaration. The following passages will serve to show its use:

Matt. x, 22. "But he that endureth to *the end* shall be saved."

Chap. xxiv, 13. "But he that shall endure unto *the end* the same shall be saved."

These texts may at first seem to refer to some other time or event, but the following from the same chapter clearly give their meaning.

Verse 6. "And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of war; see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but *the end* is not yet."

Verse 14. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall *the end* come."

By turning back to verse 3, we find that the question which called forth these remarks was concerning the coming of Christ and the end of the world. Here the end of the world or age is connected with the coming of Christ, as in the following texts:

Matt. xiii, 39. "The harvest is the end of the world." Compare chap. xxiv, 30, 31.

Chap. xxviii, 20. "And lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."

This gives the utmost limit to the preaching of the gospel, according to "the great commission," and extends no farther than the end of this age.

2 Cor. i, 13, 14. "For we write none other things unto you than what ye read or acknowledge, and I trust ye shall acknowledge even to *the end*; as also ye have acknowledged us in part, that we

are your rejoicing even as ye also are ours, in the day of the Lord Jesus."

"The day of the Lord Jesus," when the faithful who had listened to the good news preached by Paul would be his rejoicing, is defined in 1 Thess. ii, 19. "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ *at his coming*?"

Rev. ii, 26. "And he that overcometh and keepeth my works unto *the end*, to him will I give power over the nations."

Now as far as the use of the phrase is concerned, we find it generally refers to the time of Christ's coming. And the question arises, Is 1 Cor xv, 24, an exception to its general use? I think not; for the connection as clearly fixes it to that time as any of the preceding texts. Notice the immediate connection. "Christ the first-fruits: afterward they that are Christ's *at his coming*. THEN COMETH THE END." Here in the connection we find the coming of Christ, but not one word about the 1000 years, or any other period succeeding. But if *the end* does not here refer to the time of his coming, then I ask, *Is there any thing in the context to which it can refer?* This may seem to be a singular question, but I ask it seriously. I have no disposition to grant what is claimed—that it refers to the termination of the 1000 years' reign, as *that is the very point to be proved*, and to quote it as it has been quoted by the Age-to-Come writers, is only endeavoring to make an assumption prove itself! And this brings me to notice,

2. *The end is not synchronous with the deliver-*

ing up of the kingdom. If this be so it is plainly settled that the view I call in question is erroneous. The text reads: "Then cometh the end when he SHALL HAVE DELIVERED up the kingdom to God." By this it is plain that the kingdom is delivered up *before the end*; and of course *the end* cannot refer to "the close of the reign," as Mr. Marsh has it. Mr. Stephenson makes it the close of an "independent reign," which is no better; for it may be the close in one sense as well as another, so far as the question of time is concerned. But we see it is not the close in any sense—they are separate events. And he makes the delivering up necessary "that the Father may be supreme." But when we consider the relation the two thrones sustain to each other—that Christ receives his own throne by the gift of the Father—the idea seems truly absurd that Christ must deliver up to the Father the throne of David, or his own throne, in order that the Father may be supreme! as it implies that by the gift of the throne of David to Christ, the Father's throne—the throne of the universe—lost its supremacy.

This idea of an "independent reign," is evidently thrown in to obviate a difficulty which many have rushed into by limiting the reign of Christ on his own throne. Thus it does not look consistent for Mr. Marsh to talk of "the close" of a reign which the scriptures declare shall be forever, of which there shall be *no end*." But I am free to admit that if the text does bring us down to the termination of the 1000 years, and the reign here spoken of is the 1000 years' reign, then the language of Mr. Marsh is warranted. The views of

both writers harmonize in this respect:—they believe he reigns *till* a certain work is accomplished; that it will be accomplished in 1000 years subsequent to the advent; and as he reigns till a certain point, and then delivers up the kingdom, if the above view of the reign be correct, it is surely right to call it the *end of the reign*. For as he receives the kingdom of the Father, so his delivering up to the Father what he received from him would terminate the reign. But as *the end*, referred to in the text, and the time of delivering up the kingdom are not the same, their view is wrong, and the scripture stands clear which gives him an unlimited reign on the throne of David. Said the Prophet, "Of the increase of his government and peace *there shall be NO END*; upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth, even *forever*." Isa. ix, 7. Said the angel, "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David, and he shall rule over the house of Jacob *forever*, and of his kingdom there shall be *NO END*." Luke i, 33. Paul, quoting the scripture, says, "Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." Heb. i, 8.

Not long since I heard one try to evade this point by saying that Christ's reign will be only of 1000 years' duration, and that the term forever was used in respect to it in a limited sense. Webster's large dictionary, which is very full in giving every sense in which words may be used, gives two definitions to the word *forever*: (1.) At all times; (2.) To eternity; through endless ages. Common

sense would teach us that it must often have both significations, that is, be used to express continuity and eternity both at once. It certainly cannot be used in either sense in regard to that which does not exist continually. If it be used to express the uninterrupted, connected existence of that which is limited in duration, it is used in the first sense; but when it refers to that which never ceases, it is used in the second sense above given, and indeed, in both at once; for that which is not perpetual cannot properly be called eternal.

But when it is used in a limited sense, there must be something in the connection to show in what sense it is used, otherwise it would be ambiguous, or indefinite, and should not be offered to prove anything. Then I would ask, Are we not fully warranted in saying that it is used in its fullest or most unlimited sense when referring to that of which it is said, "There shall be no end." Now every measured period, however long, must have an end, even though it be millions multiplied by millions; otherwise an expression of measurement or duration would denote nothing. Language is designed to express ideas; but if the expressions, "*the end*," and "*no end*," are used to signify the same thing, the effect produced is only confusion. To me it is very evident that the reign and kingdom spoken of in 1 Cor. xv, 24, 25, which continues *till* a certain time, and is then *delivered up*, cannot be identical with that of Luke i, 33, which is forever and has no end, or of Dan. vii, 14, which does not pass away.

These points are strongly against the view I call in question; and it appears plain to me that the

end spoken of in 1 Cor. xv, is the time of Christ's coming, and that the kingdom referred to is delivered up previous to that event. I would next call attention to the fact that,

3. *The work of subduing his enemies is never in the scriptures ascribed to Christ.* Mr. Marsh's third point is: "One grand object of his reign is to subdue or destroy his enemies;" and Mr. Stephenson says: "Then the Son having reigned until he has put all enemies under his feet, delivers up the kingdom." Yet, notwithstanding this opinion is advanced with so much confidence, (and upon it, indeed, the whole Age-to-Come theory rests,) it is altogether unscriptural. But many will be ready to inquire, Does not this text say he must reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet? Yes; and Zech. vi, 13, also says *he* shall sit as priest and rule upon *his* throne; but I trust I have shown, in my remarks on the Melchisedec priesthood, that his priestly rule is not upon his own throne, but upon that of his Father in heaven. So in the text in question; it does not say that he shall reign upon the throne of David till his enemies are put under his feet, as *they are put down when he takes that throne*. So much has been said and written on the subject of Christ's subduing all his enemies and putting them under his feet in the Age to Come, that I wish all to mark well this point. In this scripture, as in Zech. vi, 12, 13, there are two persons brought to view, and the pronouns *he* and *him* refer to both; and we must apply them so as to preserve the sense of the text, and harmonize it with the other scriptures. The view advocated by Messrs. Marsh,

Stephenson and others of like faith, not only contradicts other passages, but positively destroys the sense of this. To show the utter absurdity of the supposition that Christ subdues his enemies, and puts them under his feet in the Age to Come, (or any other age,) I will paraphrase the text by leaving out the pronouns, and inserting the name according to that view. It will then read—

“Christ the first-fruits: afterward they that are Christ’s at Christ’s coming. Then cometh the end, when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when Christ shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For Christ must reign till Christ hath put all enemies under Christ’s feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For Christ hath put all things under Christ’s feet. But when Christ saith, All things are put under Christ, it is manifest that Christ is excepted which did put all things under Christ. And when all things shall be subdued unto Christ, then shall the Son (Christ) also himself be subject unto Christ that put all things under Christ, that God may be all in all.”

This is worse—far worse, than nonsense; yet how will the “Age-to-Come” believer avoid accepting this as the substance of his faith? It is evident that Christ becomes subject to him that puts all things under him; and if he subdues his enemies and puts them under his own feet, as they declare, then it is equally evident that *he becomes subject to himself!!* Against this fallacy I present the truth that

4. *The Father subdues the enemies of Christ, and puts them under his feet.* Before I bring

other scriptures to bear on this fact, I will give another paraphrase of the text, supposing this declaration to be true:—

“Christ the first-fruits: afterward they that are Christ’s at Christ’s coming. Then cometh the end, when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when the Father shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For Christ must reign till the Father hath put all enemies under Christ’s feet. The last enemy shall be destroyed, death. For the Father hath put all things under Christ’s feet. But when the Father saith, All things are put under Christ, it is manifest that the Father is excepted which did put all things under Christ. And when all things shall be subdued unto Christ, then shall the Son (Christ) also himself be subject unto the Father that put all things under Christ, that God may be all in all.”

With the beauty and truthfulness of this view all must be struck at a glance. The error of the other view is in referring the pronouns to Christ throughout, when it is evident that they refer to both Father and Son immediately after both are introduced in verse 24. As it is clear that the Father puts all things under the Son, we come next to notice when and where this work is accomplished. Is it during the 1000 years, while Christ is on the throne of David? It is not; but,

5. *Christ rules on the throne, and in the kingdom of the Father until his enemies are put under his feet.* J. Marsh has laid great stress on his construction of this text, considering it sufficient to prove his whole theory. But his construction

is wrong, and his theory baseless. Others besides him have used this text as a stronghold; but with the establishment of this truth in regard to *the reign*, all claims of the Age to Come on this text are forever put at rest; and a mass of parallel scriptures, urged by the writers on that theory, are taken out of their hands and arrayed in favor of the truth that the enemies of Christ will be "dashed in pieces" at his coming.

Now that Christ is to reign as king in two localities, that is, occupy two thrones, is proved by Rev. iii, 21.: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in *my throne*, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in *his throne*." Thus, while Christ is on the throne of the Father, he is only in expectation of his own throne. That this is the past and present position of our exalted Head, is further proved by Heb. viii, 1: "We have such an High Priest who is set down on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens." And that that is where he will reign till all enemies are put under his feet, is clearly proved by the scriptures. Ps. cx, 1. "The LORD said unto my Lord: Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." This is quoted by Jesus, as recorded by the gospels. Matt. xxii, 44; Mark xii, 36; Luke xx, 42, 43; and also by Peter, [Acts ii, 34, 35,] in his argument on the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus. "For David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool." This is a sure application of David's prophecy, and proves the loca-

tion of the reign, until his foes are made his footstool, to be "in the heavens," where Jesus ascended. I hope none of the enemies of truth will mock at this scripture, and derisively call it a "*sky kingdom*," but remember that God is there, sitting upon the throne of his holiness; for "The Lord hath prepared his throne *in the heavens*; and his kingdom ruleth over all." Ps. ciii, 19.

Paul also makes mention of the same in Heb. i, 13, in remarking on the superiority of Christ to the angels. Again, after affirming the position of our High Priest in chap. viii, and his mediatorial work in the heavenly holy places under the new covenant [chap. ix], he says, "But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Chap. x, 12, 13. This point is established beyond the possibility of a doubt; and the true sense of the scripture is at once perceived. Christ the first-fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end (at his coming), when he shall have delivered up the Melchisedec kingdom to God, even the Father; when the Father shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For Christ must reign on the Father's throne—at his right hand, till his enemies are put under his feet, or made his footstool. Then the Son leaves the throne of the universe, and also becomes subject. It will now appear evident that—

6. *Christ delivers up that kingdom, or leaves the Father's throne, and takes the throne of David before his coming.* The first part of this prop-

osition is proved by the text. At the end, which is at his coming he *shall have delivered* up the kingdom, which must be what has been termed the Melchisedec kingdom—the resignation of the office of *Priest-king*. That he takes the throne of David, or his own throne, before his return to earth, is proved by many scriptures. Luke xix, 12. “A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return.” Verse 15. “And it came to pass that when he was returned, *having received the kingdom,*” &c. The receiving of the kingdom here spoken of, is the same as that of Dan. vii, 13, 14, and both agree with the putting of all things under Christ. Mr. Marsh’s remarks on Dan. vii, 13, 14, are worthy of notice. He quotes and comments as follows:

“I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him.

“The order laid down is—

“a. Coming of the Son of man.

“b. Giving of the Son of man dominion, glory and a kingdom.

“c. All people, nations, and languages, and all dominions [rulers], serve and obey the Son of man, the Lord and King of the whole earth.”—*Age to Come*, p. 13.

It may not be wondered at that a superficial reading of 1 Cor. xv. 23–28, should produce such

a view as that advanced by Messrs. Marsh and Stephenson; but no one, however superficial, can possibly read the coming or advent of Christ out of Dan vii, 13, 14, *unless* it be assumed that the Ancient of days is on the earth prior to the advent, for he came *to* the Ancient of days, and was *brought near before* him. But Mr. M.’s view would make it read that he came *from* the Ancient of days, and was *taken far away* from him. And even on the assumption that the Ancient of days is on the earth at his coming, it will not harmonize that view with the scriptures which teach that he *has received* the kingdom when he comes, as in Luke xix. His receiving the kingdom must be identical with the marriage of the Lamb, which takes place before he comes; as the “little flock” are to wait “for the Lord when he will return from the wedding” [Luke xii, 36]; then they will be taken to the mansions prepared in the “Father’s house,” where they will sit down at the marriage supper.

A careful examination of the Scriptures will show that the coming to the Ancient of days, where he receives the kingdom [Dan. vii, 13, 14], is parallel with his *coming to his temple*, [Mal. iii, 1], where he sits as “a refiner and purifier of silver” [verse 3], and with his going in to the marriage [Matt. xxv], where he receives as his own the New Jerusalem, the Bride, (whose children we are by adoption), the capital of the kingdom which he there receives. And throwing off the figures, this signifies his going into the most holy place to cleanse the sanctuary, blot out the transgressions of Israel, finish his priestly rule,

and receive his own throne and kingdom, when his enemies are put under his feet; a work which commenced, according to the prophets, in 1844, and will terminate just previous to the pouring out of the seven last plagues. The announcement made under the sounding of the seventh trumpet is, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever." Rev. xi, 15. This agrees with Dan. vii, and as these kingdoms are given to him by the Ancient of days in heaven, he comes to earth as King of kings, and Lord of lords. Rev. xix.

There can certainly be no difference in time between his receiving the kingdom and having his enemies put under his feet—they must be identical. For, although the capital, Jerusalem, and its location, Zion, are in heaven, the purchased possession awaiting redemption is in the hands of his enemies—the Devil and his servants. But there is a difference between having his enemies put under him, and destroying them. In 1 Cor. xv, 28, the same Greek word is used to express the subduing of all things to the Son, and the subjection of the Son to the Father. "And when all things shall be subdued (*hupotasso*) unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject (*hupotasso*) unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." The order given in Ps. ii, 8, 9, is, (1) The Father gives them to his Son, (2) The Son breaks them with a rod of iron, and dashes them in pieces; which dashing, as has been shown, takes place at his coming.

7. *Death (the last enemy of them that are*

Christ's) will be destroyed or swallowed up in victory at his coming. If it could be shown that verse 24 stood connected with Rev. xx, it would present no greater difficulty than that presented by the Age to Come, even allowing all they claim on 1 Cor. xv, 23-28; for they must then place 1000 years between events immediately connected in the text. But I see no necessity for thus disconnecting this verse from the remainder of the discourse. That we have now the true sense of the text, so far as we have examined it, I consider too plain to need any further proof; the truth of the following points must also be allowed, on examination.

(1.) After plainly declaring the general resurrection, in verse 22, the Apostle takes up the "order" of "them that are Christ's at his coming," and pursues it to the end of the chapter; and it is only as the enemy of the saints that death is destroyed.

(2.) The resurrection of the righteous is the same as death being *swallowed up* in victory. Verse 54. Whiting renders verse 24, death will be *conquered*; and the expressions, *conquered*, and *swallowed up*, appropriately refer to the last enemy of the saints, but not of the wicked.

(3.) The wicked will never be released from death—the second death. If they are, they must have a second resurrection. Dr. Clarke says, "Death shall be destroyed: *katargeitai*: shall be counter-worked, subverted, and finally overturned. But death cannot be destroyed by there being simply no further death; death can only be destroyed and annihilated by a general resurrec-

tion." This is true; and will so appear to all who have considered death as simply the opposite or absence of life, and not as an entity possessed of physical proportions. And this view is also endorsed by those who urge the opposite to sustain their theories. For instance, in the *Atonement*, p. 64, Mr. Stephenson says, "The Bible leaves all the wicked under the dominion of the second death, from which it offers no hope of a resurrection."

CHAPTER V.

PROMISES TO ISRAEL.

God chose the children of Israel, and separated them to himself, and made them the depositaries of his truth. *Our relation* to the truth committed to them involves the whole question of our duty to God; and *their relation* to the truth and promises given to them determines their future destiny. No subject in the Bible can be of more importance than this, as on a correct understanding of it depends an understanding of the purposes of God in both covenants; and there is no subject on which a greater misunderstanding exists. Where a diversity of views exists there must be some error, and according to our introductory remarks, we believe there is a means of determining where the truth is on this subject. An examination of two points is necessary to settle this controversy.

1. The conditional nature of the promises made to the Jews.

2. Under which of the two covenants the special blessings to them were to be conferred.

On the first I would remark that all of God's purposes of grace to man, are conditional. To deny this, is to advocate Universalism, and deny free agency. True, he chose them for the love that he had to their fathers, but their fathers obtained the blessings by faithful obedience, and to the children the *continuance* of these favors was contingent on their obedience. This is so evident that it needs no proof. When God required Pharaoh to let them go, it was, not only that he might bless them, but that they might serve him. Ex. x, 3. And he said to them, "*If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me,*" &c. Ex. xix. See Lev. xxvi.

As the blessings set before them were conditional, they could *claim* them only on the fulfillment of the conditions. But the Scriptures abundantly prove that they were "a disobedient and gain-saying people." Therefore it must be admitted that they can receive nothing in the future for any consideration in the past. And therefore if any promise is fulfilled in their behalf in the future, it must be on the performance on their part of the conditions on which it is based. But if they fail to fulfill the condition, the blessing is of course forfeited, and the promise cannot be fulfilled.

On the second point the conclusion is equally evident. *The first covenant has passed away, and nothing can be claimed or granted under an*

abolished system. Of course, all future blessings must be granted under the new covenant, subject to its conditions and restrictions. So we are now shut up to one single point of inquiry; to wit, Do the Scriptures teach that the natural descendants of Jacob are entitled to any special privileges or blessings under the new covenant? We affirm that they do not, and appeal to the testimony of God's word.

It will be borne in mind that we have presented evidence that the first covenant has passed away and the second been established in its stead. See pages 47 and onward. An additional testimony may be in place here, as it stands intimately connected with the promises to Israel.

Christ is the "Mediator of the new covenant." Heb. ix, 15; xii, 24. The Scriptures invariably speak of him as being a Mediator at the present time. See Heb. viii, 6; 1 Tim. ii, 5; 1 John ii, 1; Heb. ix, 24; Rom. viii, 34. And they *never* speak of him as a priest, mediator, or intercessor in a future dispensation.

Again, the blood of Christ is "the blood of the covenant." Matt. xxvi, 28. As "the life is in the blood," and man by transgression has forfeited his life, blood is given to make an atonement. Lev. xvii, 11. Hence, "without the shedding of blood there is no remission." When Paul declares in Heb. ix, 15, that "he is the Mediator of the new testament," he gives a reason that the most strenuous advocate of the Age to Come will scarcely deny. He says, "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force

after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." Heb. ix. If Christ is not the testator here referred to, then another must die to ratify the covenant; but this will not be claimed. Thus it is proved beyond the possibility of contradiction that the new testament or covenant was ratified, or "of force," when Christ died.

Many of the advocates of the Age to Come, perhaps a large majority, contend that the offerings (or commandments contained in ordinances), will be re-instituted in that age. But according to the testimony of Paul they make themselves transgressors against the gospel and make the gospel a system of transgression against the divine economy, by setting aside that which must be re-instituted. They pervert and confound the testimony of the word, having the first covenant done away to stablish the second; the second not yet made; but when it is made it will be by the re-establishment of all the peculiarities of the first!

If all would consider the proofs that the New Covenant has been made, and the relation it sustains to the promises of God, this confusion would be avoided. But the promises are read without considering their connection with the qualifying declarations of the New Testament. This is the same manner in which the temporal millennium and other fallacies are advocated. Yet it is considered by some that the New Testament, especially Paul's letter to the Romans, sustains the Age to Come by maintaining the future fulfillment of special promises to the Jews. This we

must examine. If a few expressions only are considered, a construction may be placed upon them altogether at variance with the tenor of the whole. This should be avoided. The eleventh chapter is especially relied upon to prove that the Jews will be restored, nationally, to a pre-eminence in the purpose of God's grace; but the previous chapters positively forbid that such a construction be put upon it, and a careful examination of that chapter itself will show the unsoundness of their conclusions.

In the first chapter, after expressing his confidence in the saving power of the gospel, and laying the sure foundation of justification by faith, the apostle described the world in its sinful condition. This description has been, by some, applied to parts of the world, or to the heathen. But the Apostle makes his own application. He says, "Therefore, thou art inexcusable, O man whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things." Chap. ii, 1. From this application it is vain to appeal. The Apostle then goes on to show that Jews and Gentiles are alike subject to the wrath of God for disobedience, and are alike the recipients of his grace through patient continuance in well-doing, "for there is no respect of persons with God." That obedience, and not merely profession, name, or birth, is pleasing to God, is clearly shown in the latter part of chap. ii, where the Jew is told that if he is a transgressor of the law, his circumcision is made uncircumcision; but if the Gentile keep the law his uncircumcision is counted for circumcision.

The real advantage which the Jew possessed is stated in chap. iii, 1, 2, but in verses 9, 10, he says: "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved, both Jews and Gentiles that they were all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one." After thus proving the whole world guilty, justification by faith (the only hope of the guilty) is again introduced, and again it is declared that "there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" [verses 22, 23]; of course, boasting is excluded [verse 27]; and well may the Apostle exclaim: "Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith." Verses 29, 30.

Let those who claim a special blessing for Abraham's natural descendants carefully examine the statements in chap. iv. It begins with an inquiry as to what "Abraham, our father, as pertaining to the flesh hath found." This is an important query; for surely none of his children according to the flesh, can claim more than he, their father, obtained in that manner. But the argument of the Apostle makes it evident that he received nothing at all for such a consideration. If he received any thing as it respects the flesh, it was, of course, received as his own right, and then he would have cause to glory, though not before God [verse 2], but Paul says boasting is excluded by the law of faith, and Abraham's blessing or justification was of faith, by believing on Him that

justifieth; therefore, the children of Abraham can claim nothing by reason of their birth, but must seek it, like Abraham, by faith. And the blessing of Abraham (justification by faith), comes upon all believers, whether Jews or Gentiles; and Abraham himself received the blessing in uncircumcision, "and he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: *that he might be the father of all them that believe though they be not circumcised*; that righteousness might be imputed to them also." Verse 2. As all are sinners, all are under the condemnation of the law, and there can be no justification by the law. The children of Israel promised to keep it, but they did not; and the covenant under which they received the law could not, therefore, confer the blessing. If that covenant could have secured the blessing *they would have stood independent of Abraham, and thus have set aside justification by faith*, and destroyed the claim of all believers; as it is said in verse 14, "*For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect*, and in Gal. iii, 18: "For if the inheritance be of the law it is not of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." I hope all who are affected with Judaizing notions will carefully consider these points.

In the succeeding chapters are enforced the declarations respecting the law and justification by faith, and the subject of Abraham's children is again brought up in chap. ix. Some of the expressions in this chapter have been considered; and although Paul was by birth a Jew, and had a

feeling for his "kinsmen according to the flesh," he could not deny himself and destroy the facts set forth in the previous chapters, but cuts off the claim of the unfaithful to the name of *Israel*, or *Abraham's children*. And it is of those—the unbelieving descendants of Jacob—that he speaks in his comparison of the vessels of the potter; God had endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction. Verse 22. He has certainly endured much of that rebellious people, considering the privileges conferred upon them; and the application is evident from this connection, and from chap. x. 21. "But to Israel he saith, all day long have I stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." The believers in Christ, "not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles," are "vessels of mercy" prepared unto glory; and the prophecies as well as the promise to Abraham are brought in to attest this truth. Hosea says: "I will call them *my people*, which were not my people; and her *beloved*, which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God."

These promises refer to, and are fulfilled in, the new covenant. And we hence learn that where God spoke of *his beloved* and *his people* in the past dispensation, he referred to the descendants of Jacob; but the same terms when used in prophecies reaching beyond that dispensation refer as well to the Gentiles, who are "fellow-heirs, and of the same body," and partakers of the *same promises*.

I come now to an examination of chap. xi, which has been termed (incorrectly, I think), the stronghold of Judaism. The expressions in previous chapters, also in the letter to the Ephesians, are plain and positive, and clearly prove that God has no *special regard* for the literal descendants of Jacob; and that his purposes and promises will all be fulfilled without again building up the middle wall that Christ in his gospel has broken down. And if Paul has here shown that in the purposes of God's grace there is a difference, he has certainly contradicted what he has said in other scriptures, especially in Romans ii and ix, and in his letter to the Ephesians. One fact is siezed upon as favoring that view, viz. : that a difference is admitted between Israel and the believing Gentiles; and a *supposition* has obtained that Paul also teaches that all Israel will be saved after the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. These two points we will now consider.

1. We admit that there is a difference, nationally, but this admission does not favor their view of this question. To maintain their view they must not only show a difference of birth, but ~~and~~ they must also show that they are not fellow-heirs and partakers of the same promises. Many are ready to admit that "in Christ" they are "one body," and partakers of the same promises "in the gospel," and not otherwise. But to this we reply that all of God's gracious purposes are "in Christ;" for, as the first covenant made with Israel at Sinai has passed away, we necessarily turn back to the original promise or Abrahamic covenant, which is identical with the gos-

pel; all the promises to him being fulfilled in his seed, which is Christ. Beyond this we claim that *Israel* is used in two senses, of which we shall speak hereafter.

2. It is claimed that Paul teaches that all Israel will be saved after the fullness of the Gentiles be come. To maintain this they say that blindness has happened to them only *in part*. Rom. xi, 25. True, God hath not cast them away in the sense of utterly rejecting them but still calls on them to be reconciled to him, and receive the blessing of Abraham through faith in Christ. And blindness has happened to them only *in part*. This is expressive of *extent* only; for the *duration* of this blindness, see verses 9, 10; and Isa. vi, 9-11. If blindness had happened to them *wholly*, not even a remnant could be saved; and *all Israel* to whom the promises are made is only a remnant. There are others that are "*of Israel*," but the remnant alone are Israel. Will any claim salvation for more of them than the remnant? If so, where is the promise? Paul makes the promise of God fulfilled in the remnant [chap. ix, 27, 28], and says, "And as Esaias said before, Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed [a very small remnant, Isa. i, 9], we had been as Sodoma, and been made like unto Gomorrah." Verse 29. He claims no more than this in Rom. xi, and certainly no scripture presents a more favorable appearance for Judaism. And as the promise only refers to the remnant, and they all have equal privileges with the Gentiles there is no need of a change of dispensation, or that they receive special privileges in order to its ful-

fillment. But they claim that the fullness of the Gentiles must come in first. *There is the great mistake.* The text does not say, *And then*, nor *after that time*, shall all Israel be saved; but it says, "And SO shall all Israel be saved." Verse 26. The definition of *so*, is *thus*, or *in like manner*, and by examining the whole context we find that it refers to the act of grafting into the good olive tree through faith. Of the word *so*, Webster says it is followed by *as*. Walker says, it answers to *as*, either preceding or following; and there is no antecedent to which it can refer but this: that *as* the fullness of the Gentiles shall be brought in through their faith, and ingrafted into the good olive tree, (which is Christ), *so* (in like manner), shall all Israel (the remnant) be saved; for, "they also, *if they continue not in unbelief*, shall be grafted in again." Thus it is seen that the 25th verse refers to *manner* and not to *time*, and the fulfillment is only in Christ. But the question of time is clearly settled in the first part of the chapter. Having previously settled the point that the remnant only have a promise, he says: Even so then AT THIS PRESENT TIME also there is a remnant according to the election of grace." Verse 5. Josiah Litch, on verses 26, 27, says:

"And so all Israel, the holy seed, as above, who shall return, as the substance of the seared oak, 'shall be saved,' in the kingdom of God, and unto eternal life. 'As it is written,' in Isa. lix, 20, 'There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.' This is nearly a literal rendering of the Septua-

gint version, while the reading of our translation of the passage is a literal rendering of the Hebrew, as follows: 'And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob.'

CHAPTER VI.

PROMISES TO ISRAEL. CONTINUED.

The promises to Israel may be embraced in the three subjects of the land, the kingdom, and a gathering or return.


All of *our views* of the Old Testament promises and prophecies must bow to the expositions in the New Testament. Having examined the more general declarations concerning the hope of Israel, we will now consider the particular points or subjects of promise, to show the perfect harmony of the word of God in the several lights in which it may be viewed.

§ 1. THE LAND.

The only question that can possibly arise in regard to the promise of the land to Israel is this:—Will these promises be fulfilled in the gospel, or out of it—under the new covenant, or the old? If it can be shown that they will be fulfilled out of the gospel, or under the old covenant, then they may also be local and exclusive. But if they are in the gospel, or under the New Covenant, then they are general, and the Gentiles may be fellow-heirs. We think this question is easily

settled; indeed a word of proof on this subject should not be required by any Bible student.

They cannot be fulfilled under the old covenant, for, (1.) They forfeited all claims under that by transgression. (2.) That has passed away and been superseded by the new. (3.) It is an offense against the new, or the gospel, to revive or "build again" the old; as some claim will be done. Gal. ii, 18. (4.) The priests or mediators of that covenant could not take away their sins [Heb. x, 1-4], so they could not recover what they lost by transgression.

To confirm these facts observe that the Lord gave as a reason for making a new covenant with them, that they had broken his covenant which he made with them at Sinai; and although he had promised to be their God, and that they should be a peculiar treasure to him above all people, yet when it was broken by them he could not consistently perform his promise, and so he "regarded them not;" they were on a level with other sinful nations. Rom. iii, 9-19. This should forever settle the question, that they could acquire no title to an inheritance under that covenant.  And if they had any claim under it, it could not have been abolished without an infringement on their rights. It seems very plain indeed that they can only possess the land by complying with the conditions of the new covenant, which is the only one that ever could convey any title to an inheritance. The question yet to be considered is, What inheritance or land is promised under the new covenant?

As the original promise was made to Abraham

and confirmed in Christ, we must look both ways for an answer to the question; for Christ is mediator and first heir, and it can be received only through him and under the covenant of which he is the mediator.

Abraham was promised a land for an everlasting possession, and circumcision was instituted as a token of this covenant. Now our opponents assume that a certain part of the earth in its present form must be conferred on his descendants to meet the promise. It is claimed that the promise to Abraham embraced *ONLY* the land *that he saw*; but he did not see all of the present earth, nor any of the new earth. Hence they conclude that *what he saw* would fulfill the promise. What he saw will doubtless be given to him, but not that *only*, nor in the condition in which he saw it. Paul places the subject in its proper light. He says: "For the promise that he should be the *HEIR* of *THE WORLD*, was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. iv, 13. Then Abraham is heir of the world. "By faith he sojourned in the *land of promise* as in a *strange country*," as other faithful ones, who, with him, "confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims *ON THE EARTH*." Heb. xi, 9, 13.

Again, Christ is the seed to whom the promises were made [Gal. iii, 16]; he is the *heir of the world*, and the Father promised to give him "the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession." Ps. ii, 8. As he is the heir, so the saints are made "joint-heirs" with him; and by reason of this joint-heirship, "the meek shall inherit the

errth." To *inherit* is to receive *by heirship*; but there is no promise or heirship by which we can receive the earth except that to Abraham; Christ is heir as Abraham's seed: hence, the Abrahamic covenant embraced the world, even to its uttermost parts. The land which the children of Israel possessed under Joshua, is clearly shown in Hebrews, chap. iii and iv, to be typical of the rest which remains to the people of God.

We next consider the *token* of this covenant. This was an outward ordinance; and no one pretends that it is now necessary to observe circumcision as it was first observed in order to be constituted an heir, because the New Testament teaches otherwise. That is not circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter. Analogy would teach us that the promise of *the land* be as much enlarged in the New Testament, as *the seed* of Abraham, which is made to extend to the Gentiles; or the *token*—circumcision—which is no more external, but internal and spiritual.

In Rom. iv, 11, this token is entitled a sign and seal. In Eph. i, 13, 14, the Apostle says: "Ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." We here learn that the inheritance, already purchased, is yet to be redeemed, and we receive the token, earnest, or assurance thereof until its redemption. The sign reaches no farther than to the thing signified: we have the earnest or assurance reaching to the point of realization, but it

would convey no assurance beyond that point; therefore our inheritance cannot be fully realized, till the purchased possession is redeemed. This proves conclusively that the earth renewed, or the new earth, is the subject of the promise of the Abrahamic covenant. Jesus, the mediator and heir, is now ministering for those of both dispensations, or for transgressions under both covenants, "that they which are called might receive the promise of an *eternal inheritance*." Heb. ix, 15. All who lived under the first covenant were transgressors; of course they forfeited the blessings placed before them. Jesus secures to the faithful among them an eternal inheritance—not a temporal possession; not under the curse as it is at this time, but redeemed: so that the hope of all now rests on "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away." 1 Pet. i, 4. As before said, to *inherit*, is to *possess by heirship*; and if we receive an *inheritance* redeemed, incorruptible, and undefiled, these conditions must necessarily be attached to the possession named in the will by which we are constituted heirs. This will is the Abrahamic covenant: the only source of any blessing since its ratification by the death of Jesus.

§ 2. THE KINGDOM.

A few thoughts will only be demanded on this point in addition to those previously given on the reign of Christ over the true Israel. But it will be borne in mind that the promises of the kingdom to the descendants of Jacob were conditional, all of which were forfeited under the old cove-

nant; and they can only be regained by obtaining an interest in Jesus, now the prince, soon to be crowned King. The first promise of a kingdom to that people is found in the covenant made at Horeb, recorded in Ex. xix, the condition of which was that they were to obey God's voice and keep his covenant, or the ten commandments. Deut. iv, 12, 13. Again, a conditional promise is stated in Ps. lxxxix. But the fact of its being forfeited by them is shown in many scriptures: most clearly in our Saviour's words to them in Matt. xxi. After condemning them out of their own mouths, he adds: "Therefore say I unto you, *The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.*" Verse 43. And an Apostle declared that the poor of this world, *rich in faith*, are heirs of the kingdom which God hath promised *to them that love him.* Jas. ii, 5. See also remarks on Rom. ix, and Eph. ii and iii.

§ 3. THE RETURN OF ISRAEL.

Perhaps no one subject has been talked of so much which is yet so little understood as this. "The return of the Jews" is a stereotyped theological phrase, but the views entertained on it are vague and indefinite. Our faith on this point is easily expressed. We believe in the gathering of Israel to their own land; but we must apply the same New Testament rules here that we have to other classes of promises, to wit: that the true Israel are of faith, and the Gentiles by faith are made partakers of the promises. There are two classes of Old Testament prophecies on this sub-

ject, one harmonizing or agreeing with New Testament declarations on the same subject, to be fulfilled in the future, the other agreeing with the history of the past. It will be impossible to notice these to a great extent, yet a few examples will be necessary to show it in its true light.

Those who advocate the return of the Jews in the Age to Come, do it on the assumption that there has never been a gathering of Israel since the Babylonian captivity. But that this is a mere assumption, and an error, can be shown by both sacred and profane history. There is some disagreement amongst chronologists as to the precise date of some of the prophetic writings; but in this they all agree that all the prophets except Malachi wrote before the return of the Jews from Babylon. They may be given about as follows: Isaiah, 758 B. C.; Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Obadiah, 588; Daniel, 534; Hosea, 725; Joel, 761, Amos, 787; Jonah, 800; Micah, 758; Nahum, 720; Habakkuk, 605; Zephaniah, 608; Haggai and Zechariah, 518; Malachi, 400. These will include the *latest* periods of their prophecies, and the *decree* for the return was in 457. Hence, quotations from their writings to sustain the theory in question have the full weight of chronology against their being so applied. And we shall see that the texts themselves, do not favor that view.

Isaiah xliii, has been quoted with confidence. This was written before the captivity, and the reference to its fulfillment in the connection is so plain that no mistake can arise respecting it, if it is read with any care and attention.

"But now thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee: and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee. For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee. Since thou wast precious in my sight, thou hast been honorable, and I have loved thee: therefore will I give men for thee, and people for thy life. Fear not; for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west: I will say to the north, Give up: and to the south, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth: even every one that is called by my name: for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him: yea, I have made him." Verses 1-7.

Also in chap. xlv, 26, the Lord declares himself as their redeemer "that saith to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited; and to the cities of Judah, Ye shall be built, and I will raise up the decayed places thereof" (margin—wastes). In verse 28 the instrumentality used in the fulfillment is shown:—"That saith to Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid."

By turning to the record we find that the decree for the return of the children of Israel was

a very liberal one, giving full permission to all *who would* to return. No more liberal decree could be given, unless it were one of *compulsion*, requiring them to return whether they would or not. But no prophecy contemplates this.

"Now in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his realm, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth: and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you *of all his people*? his God be with him, and *let him go up* to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God), which is in Jerusalem. And *whosoever remaineth in any place* where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, besides the free-will offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem." Ezra i, 1-4. Again, in the decree of Artaxerxes, chap. vii, 13:—"I make a decree, that *all they of the people of Israel*, and of his priests and Levites, in my realm which are minded of their own free will to go up to Jerusalem, go with thee." Jeremiah, speaking of the return of Israel *from all the nations* and *from all the places* whither they had been driven, introduces the same condition that Artaxerxes does in his decree:—they shall go up voluntarily. "For thus saith the Lord, That af-

ter seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place. For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the Lord, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end. Then shall ye call upon me, and ye shall go and pray unto me, and I will hearken unto you. And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart. And I will be found of you, saith the Lord: and I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from all the places whither I have driven you, saith the Lord; and I will bring you again into the place whence I caused you to be carried away captive." Jer. xxix, 10-14. He also places this general gathering after the seventy years' captivity.

These plain declarations are sufficient to cut off the assumption of our opponents, that only two tribes returned, while the ten remained scattered. There is no evidence that *all* of *any* tribe returned, while we have evidence that *some* of *each* tribe returned, even all that were willing.

Josephus proves conclusively that twelve tribes were restored after this captivity. He says that Ptolemy Philadelphus sent a request to the Jews to "send six of the elders out of every tribe," for the purpose of translating the law into the Greek. When they were sent, word was returned to Ptolemy thus: "We have chosen six men out of every tribe, whom we have sent and the law with them." Josephus says they sent *seventy-two*; thus the twelve tribes were represented. See *Josephus Ant. B. 12, ch. 2, sec. 4-7*.

This testimony is corroborated by Scripture. That the tribe of Levi was represented in the return is evident, for the priests were all of that tribe. But Ezra says further, "So the priests and the Levites, and some of the people, and the singers, and the porters, and the Nethinims, dwelt in their cities, and ALL ISRAEL in their cities." Ezra ii, 70. "And when the seventh month was come, and *the children of Israel were in the cities*, the people gathered themselves together as one man to Jerusalem." Chap. iii, 1; Neh. vii, 73.

When the temple was built, it was dedicated as related by Ezra. "And the children of Israel, the priests and the Levites, and *the rest of the children of the captivity*, kept the dedication of this house of God with joy, and offered at the dedication of this house of God an hundred bullocks, two hundred rams, four hundred lambs; and for a sin offering *for all Israel*, TWELVE he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel." Ezra vi, 16, 17; viii, 35. If ten tribes were lacking it would be truly singular, that it should not be mentioned in such a connection as this.

There is another *gathering of Israel* spoken of in both Testaments, which we will briefly notice. Isa. xxvii evidently refers to it. Note in verse 11 the expression parallel to Rom. xi. "When the boughs thereof are withered, they shall be broken off; the women come and set them on fire, for it is a people of no understanding; therefore he that made them will not have mercy on them, and he that formed them will show them no favor. And it shall come to pass in that day

that the Lord shall beat off from the channel of the river into the stream of Egypt, and *ye shall be gathered one by one*, O ye children of Israel. And it shall come to pass in that day, that *the great trumpet shall be blown*, and they shall come which were ready to perish in the land of Assyria; and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and shall worship the Lord in the holy mount at Jerusalem." Verses 11-13. This we think is easily identified as the gathering of the New Testament. When the Saviour comes, "he shall send his angels *with a great sound of a trumpet*, and they shall *gather together his elect from the four winds*, from one end of heaven to the other." Matt. xxiv, 31.

That this is the gathering of Israel referred to in the prophets is proved by reference to Eze. xxxvii. After relating the vision and the revivifying of the dry bones, the Lord said, "Son of man, *these bones are THE WHOLE HOUSE OF ISRAEL*: behold they say, our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and *bring you into the land of Israel*. * * * And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and *WILL GATHER THEM* on every side, and bring them into their own land." Verses 11, 12, 21. Comp. vs. 20-28, and Rev. xxi.

This gathering is coincident with that of Matt. xxiv, above referred to, as the graves of the house

of Israel will be opened when the Lord sends his angels with a sound of a trumpet to gather his elect. The various points referred to in Isa. xxvii, Eze. xxxvii, and Matt. xxiv, are united in 1 Thess. iv, 16, 17. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and *with the trump of God*; and the *dead in Christ* shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air."

In 2 Thess. ii, the subject is also introduced of "the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and *our gathering together unto him*." This we firmly believe is the only gathering of Israel that remains to fulfill the prophecies.

THE CITY AND SANCTUARY OF EZE. XL—XLVIII.

It has been urged that the city described in the vision of Ezekiel is the same as the New Jerusalem of Revelation, and the sacrifices there spoken of signify the restoration of the sacrificial system of Leviticus, and of course the restoration of the Jewish people. We consider that this was a conditional prophecy, the promises of which have been forfeited. Notice chap. xliii, 9-11. "Now let them put away their lewdness, and the carcasses of their kings far from me, and I will dwell in the midst of them for ever. Comp. Jer. xvii, 19-27. Thou son of man, show the house to the house of Israel that they may be ashamed of their iniquities; and let them measure the pattern. And if they be ashamed of all

which they have done, show them the form of the house, and the structure thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the entrances thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the laws thereof," &c.—*Bernard's Bible*.

Though there are points of similarity between the visions of Ezekiel and John, yet similarity does not prove identity. In this case there are also points of dissimilarity, which of course forbid identity.

It is claimed that Christ is now preparing a people out of all nations to be priests in the future age. But the priests of Ezekiel's vision were all Levites. Chap. xliii, 19; xliv, 15.

It is admitted that those prepared for a place in that are immortalized at the second advent; after which they will neither marry nor be given in marriage. Luke xx, 34, 35. But there marriages of the priests are spoken of. Eze. xliv, 21, 22.

These cannot die any more, but there they could, for the priest was allowed to marry "a widow that had a priest before."—*Ibid*.

It is claimed that "David 2d, Christ," is the ruling Prince spoken of by Ezekiel. But the prince in that city was to offer a sin-offering for himself; and to refer this to Christ is not only absurd but blasphemous. Chap. xlv, 22.

Christ will have the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; but the prince there was forbidden to oppress the people, or take their possessions for his sons, but should give his sons inheritance of his own possession. Chap. xlvi, 18.

The revival of the types here spoken of is impossible. The types were shadows of things to come. No sin was remitted by means of the blood offered by the Levitical priesthood, as it only pointed to a future fact: that fact being reached by faith, and realized when all the righteous, with Daniel, stand in their lot in the person of their Advocate when he makes atonement. But such an order of things cannot exist after the priesthood of Christ closes, and we have shown that his ministration is in heaven, and closes previous to his coming. The fact cannot go before the figure or type, or the thing signified before the sign thereof; so it would be absurd to make an atonement in figure, or typically, for a sin which had already been atoned for in fact. In the gospel, repentance and confession must precede remission [Mark i, 4; Acts ii, 38; 1 John i, 9]; therefore a revival of the Levitical system is impossible, as it would require a new system to admit an atonement by type or in figure *after* the sin was committed, when, in the ministration of Christ, the atonement had been made in fact, and remission granted, *before it was committed!*

These reasons are quite sufficient to show that their view of Ezekiel cannot be correct.

CHAPTER VII.

WHO ARE ISRAEL?

We have several times referred to the "two senses" in which the term Israel is used, citing to proof texts as it was necessary to sustain the par-

ticular points under examination. We deem it necessary, however, to give more direct and full proofs on that subject, from its great importance in this connection, even though a reference to many passages may appear like a repetition. Our only object is to place the truth before the reader in the clearest manner, and most easy to be understood.

The name of Israel is significant; it is an *acquired* name. Jacob received it because he prevailed with God. Afterward it became a family and national name, but the Scriptures show that God kept its significance in view; especially is this plain in the New Testament. Hence it came to be used in *two senses*. Not observing this fact many have erred concerning God's purposes. Before passing to consider more definitely the prophetic promises, we will examine the name under which the promises are claimed.

Every thing peculiar to the Jewish system was typical; and every term by which a type is designated must be used in two senses, one referring to the type, the other to the antitype. It is not difficult to determine in what sense a term is used if we keep in view its relation to first principles, or observe to what covenant it belongs. The following are instances. Israel according to the flesh, Jews outwardly, Palestine under the curse, the sanctuary or pattern of heavenly things, Jerusalem which now is, and circumcision outward in the flesh. These are all peculiar to the first covenant. On the other hand we find Israel (the prevailers) the faithful children of promise, Jews inwardly, an incorruptible, undefiled, and eternal

inheritance, the heavenly sanctuary, Jerusalem which is above, and circumcision of the heart, in the Spirit. These are of the new covenant. These two classes belong to two different systems; one of enmity—the other of peace [Eph. ii, 14, 15]; and each has its own place in its own system, and cannot be transferred to the other by any means. So that he who is outwardly a Jew, an Israelite according to the flesh, can no more take his place in the other class, or gospel system, without becoming Abraham's seed by faith in Christ, than the Greek or the Hottentot.

D. P. Hall, writing to prove that there are great and *special* blessings yet to be conferred on the literal descendants of Jacob, remarks on Eze. xxxvi:

"There are but three positions which can be taken in regard to this promise, and many others of like import; viz: They have been fulfilled in the past history of this nation; or they will be fulfilled to those who are Israelites in the highest sense, *i. e.*, after the law of faith; or they remain to be fulfilled to the natural descendants. The last named position is the only one admissible in the scripture now under investigation."

And again he quotes from Eze. xxxvii, and inserts an explanation in parentheses as follows:

"So shall they be my people, and I will be their God. And David (David 2d, Christ) my servant shall be a king over them, and they shall have one shepherd," &c.

Here we notice that he has admitted that there are two senses in which the term Israel is used, but thinks (or rather *decides*) that it is not al-

lowable to use it in the "highest sense." Yet in quoting a parallel promise in which it is said David shall be king over them, he uses *David* in the "highest sense," by referring it to Christ.

By what authority does he put "David 2d, Christ," in the prophecy of Ezekiel, while he arbitrarily denies us the privilege of putting "Israel 2d, of faith," in the same connection?

There are, by his own showing, two Israel's and two Davids; and David 1st has reigned over the first Israel, and now he contends that David 2d will also reign over the first Israel. But the first Israel and the reign of the first David belonged entirely to the first covenant, while the second Israel and "David 2d" are under the new. It is as impossible and absurd to connect the reign of David 2d with the first Israel, as it would be to connect the reign of David 1st with the second Israel. But such confusion is common with the advocates of the Age to Come. They seem to think that by quoting much Scripture they gain their point, entirely disregarding the connection, and the principles that govern its application.

It is often asserted that Gentiles by birth can have no right whatever to the name of Israel. But this is not in accordance with the Scriptures. Notice what Paul says to the Ephesians—ye were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. But what do they become when they are no more strangers, or aliens and foreigners? Take our own nation for an illustration. Here are individuals born in different countries; aliens and foreigners by birth. But they come to our shores, and by virtue of the naturalization laws they cease

to be strangers or aliens, but are constituted American citizens. *They are Americans by adoption*: and in any transaction of, or with, the government they would not be styled or treated as English, French or Germans, though they were born in England, France, or Germany. So, says Paul to the believing Gentiles, "Ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but *fellow-citizens*"—of what?—of the commonwealth of Israel. *They are Israelites by adoption*; they are of "*the same body*;" they are no more two, but one in Christ.

Again, Paul says in Rom. ix, that "they are not all Israel which are of Israel." Now it is evident that if the term Israel was strictly a national name, indicating the origin or birth of him who bore it, as our opponents claim, this declaration of Scripture could not be true, for then they who are of Israel would all be Israel, and no others.

We notice here that in the plan of the gospel there is a change in the relation of both Jews and Gentiles; that is of such as are Jews and Gentiles by birth or descent. Thus, the unbelieving descendant of Abraham and Jacob is not a child of Abraham, nor counted for his seed; nor an Israelite, according to Rom. ix. He is not of that body, nor partaker of their promises. While the faithful, Gentile born, are Abraham's seed [Gal. iii, 7, 29; Rom. iv, 11; ix, 6-8], and citizens of the commonwealth of Israel, of the same body, partakers of the same promises.

There is a very specific declaration respecting each class in Rom. ii. Circumcision distinguished between the Jews and the Gentiles. "Uncir-

cumcision which is by nature," certainly refers to Gentiles. And if the circumcised (i. e., the Jew) be a breaker of the law his circumcision is made uncircumcision; that is, his claim to the title of a Jew is reversed, and he is counted a Gentile. But if the uncircumcision (i. e., the Gentile) keep the righteousness of the law, his uncircumcision is counted for circumcision; that is, his Gentile origin is set aside, and he is counted for a Jew. This would be called an extravagant pretension by Age-to-Come Judaizers, but Paul does not leave it indefinite or open to cavil, but plainly says, "FOR HE IS NOT A JEW WHICH IS ONE OUTWARDLY," that is, by birth or natural descent: "BUT HE IS A JEW WHICH IS ONE INWARDLY," that is, of faith, whether circumcised or uncircumcised—whether Jew or Gentile by birth. How, in the face of these positive declarations, the Age to Come advocates can think to sustain their positions is a mystery. What do they do with such testimony? Nothing at all. They pass it by and arbitrarily decide that the promises do not belong to "Israel in the highest sense!" We do not wonder that there is confusion amongst the believers in that doctrine. Denying first principles, passing by the most positive declarations, wresting the promises from the gospel and placing them in a system which they are not slow to declare is abolished, they can no more hope to arrive at truth and unity than they could to arrive at perfection in numbers while denying that two and two make four.

We have shown the fallacy of restricting the

phrase, "my people," to the natural descendants of Jacob. But we are told that God's name was named on them; and so it was on "Jerusalem which now is" [see Jer. xxv, 29], yet she is rejected and so are her children. Gal. iv. Instead of being the chosen of God—his people—the Saviour said to them, "Ye are of your Father the Devil." They claim to be Jews, but they are not: they are of the synagogue of Satan. Rev. iii, 9.

It would not seem likely that any *special* promises or blessings were in reserve for the children of the Devil, as the Saviour termed the unbelieving Jews. But *in belief* they are *in Christ*, and we have fully shown that in Christ there are no special blessings. Therefore, the view we call in question is proved untrue.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SETTING UP OF GOD'S EVERLASTING KINGDOM.

There is perhaps no subject on which more misapprehension exists than on the establishment of the kingdom of God. On this point we have been often assailed, and charged with holding very absurd views in respect to it. But wherein the absurdity consists it is to be presumed our opponents have no very definite idea, as they have hitherto failed to point it out in their writings on the subject. It is but fair that we consider their view briefly, that the reader may contrast the two, and so judge between them.

According to their view, as we gather it from the most prominent authorities, the Saviour first comes, and then sets up his kingdom in Canaan or Palestine, and when established, the kingdom, by agencies not defined, destroys all the enemies of Christ (see *Age to Come*, p. 90): all his adherents having been immortalized. And then those that are left, belonging to neither of these classes—not friends nor enemies—not justified by the gospel nor condemned by the law (too good to be destroyed and too bad to be saved), are put on *a new probation* and again populate the earth. To the Jews a national pre-eminence is given (the middle wall is re-built), the apostles rule over them, and all the saints immortalized act as priests, to offer sacrifices (types of Christ's sacrifice in the past) for the sins of the probationers. The gospel (by types) will then save the *nations*, as it now saves *individuals out of* the nations: the Devil (the evil principle) is bound; sickness and death are in a measure done away: peace prevails throughout the world among the nations, while the saints, who are priests and advocates for mortals, "rule with a rod of iron," having "the high praises of God in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand, to execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people (see *Age to Come*, p. 89), and by the double process of advocacy and punishment—filling the double office of Advocates and executioners, Christ and his saints in the course of 1000 years subdue all their enemies and bring all the nations in subjection to Christ, and thus the kingdom symbolized by the stone, fills the whole earth.

Then, having restored the kingdom or world to a state of submission or loyalty, Christ delivers it up to the Father (see J. M. Stephenson). The Devil is then let loose for a little season, and in that "little season" overthrows the 1000 years' work of Christ and all his saints, so that he deceives the nations, a multitude as numerous as the sand of the sea (who had previously *been saved* by the gospel of the Age to Come!), and they of whom it was said that they should not learn war any more, are by Satan deceived and gathered to battle; and so successful are they in this brief warfare, that they *retake* the vast dominion which had been subdued to Christ and by him rendered up to the Father as a "loyal province," and drive the saints back to Jerusalem, their starting point, which they besiege; and they are then destroyed by fire from God out of heaven. Those who read the authors above referred to, and others, must acknowledge that we have done their views no injustice in the above sketch. Mr. Marsh has "Jerusalem rebuilt" as the capital of the kingdom for the Age to Come, and the New Jerusalem come down from heaven at the end of that age. But what becomes of the old city when the new one comes down he does not inform us. J. B. Cook took the position that the New Jerusalem *will not* come down from heaven, but a causeway will be erected between the new and the old, from heaven to earth, and thus a Jerusalem will be located at either end of Jacob's ladder!!! How he obtained this interesting intelligence he does not deign to inform us. J. M. Stephenson quotes Dr. Thomas to show that

the New Jerusalem, or "Jerusalem which is above" [Gal. iv], is *above* in the sense of being exalted, which denotes the position she will occupy in the Age to Come. But if the word *above* signifies her honor and glory, and not her location, then her "*coming down*" [Rev. xxi], must denote her abasement, or deprivation of that honor and glory! The criticism of Dr. Thomas on the word "*above*," as quoted by J. M. Stephenson, is not correct. Greenfield says, in his lexicon, "*Ano*, adv., above; up, upwards, that which is above, higher." Robinson says, "*Ano*, adv., up, upwards, above, i. e., (1.) of motion, up, upwards. John xi, 41; Heb. xii, 15. (2.) Of place where, up, above. Acts ii, 19."

We come now to a consideration of the scripture view of the subject.

Dan. ii, 44: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever."

On this text we enquire

1. What is the act of setting up the kingdom referred to in the text?
2. When will it break in pieces the kingdoms of earth?

It might appear to be the most natural order of inquiry to first examine when the kingdom will be set up; but we think all will agree with us, that there will be little ground for controversy on the *time*, after we have scripturally defined the *action*. Our main disagreement with the ad-

vocates of the Age to Come, is not so much on the *time* (as they seem to think), as the *nature* of the event. But we must go still further back and inquire, who is "the God of heaven" referred to by the prophet? Is it the Father or the Son? We take the position that it refers to the Father, and shall now present the scriptures which define the action of the Father in respect to the kingdom.

In 1 Chron. xvii there is a promise recorded, given to David concerning his "*seed*," clearly referring to Christ, wherein God said, "I will raise up thy seed after thee which shall be of thy sons; and *I will establish his kingdom*. He shall build me an house, and *I will establish his throne* forever. *I will settle him* in mine house and in *my kingdom*." Verses 11, 12, 14.

The word *establish* is evidently used here in the same sense that the expression *set up* is in Dan. ii. (See Webster.) It may also be used to denote the confirmation of that which is set up, and is so used in Isa. ix, 7: "Of the increase of his [Christ's] government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to *order it*, and to *establish it* with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever." Now we have in definite terms the establishment of the kingdom ascribed to both the Father and the Son; and we must look to other Scriptures to ascertain the precise work of each. That their works are different is shown in these promises. The Father says he will settle David's seed in his house and kingdom, and establish his kingdom and throne; and the Son

shall *order it* and establish it with judgment and with justice. The Father sets it up and settles the Son in it: the Son orders and rules what he has received of the Father. This view is confirmed by many scriptures.

Dan. vii, 13, 14. "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him," &c. Here is the act of the Father, to wit., conferring the kingdom on the Son of man; and the consequence, to wit., all people, nations, and languages serve him, or he *rules* in the kingdom bestowed by the Father.

Psa. ii, 8, 9, expresses the same fact: "*I shall give thee* the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. *Thou shalt* break them with a rod of iron: thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Ps. cx, 1, 2 is parallel with the foregoing: "The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: *rule thou* in the midst of thine enemies." Also Luke i, 32, 33: "*The Lord God shall give* unto him the throne of his father David. *And he shall rule* over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

It will be noticed in all these passages that the only work ascribed to the Father is that of *giving the throne and kingdom to his Son*, thereby putting his enemies under his feet. All else—the

dashing, breaking, destroying (his enemies), ruling, and ordering it—is the work of the Son. See also Luke xiv, 12, where the Saviour likens himself to "a certain nobleman who went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. And it came to pass, that when he was returned, *having received the kingdom*, then he commanded," &c. Verse 15. According to Age-to-Come teachers *he only received something to make a kingdom of*; but the Scriptures teach differently. He has received the kingdom when he returns; the *kingdom* is given to him when he is brought to the Ancient of days. Dan. vii. But they urge that the *materials* or parts of which the kingdom is composed are not yet arranged in order, and therefore the kingdom is not yet set up when the Lord returns. But they are in error here the same that we have shown them to be in error on 1 Cor. xv, viz., they make no distinction between the work of the Father and the Son. It is the work of the Son to order and arrange his kingdom, but not, of course, until it becomes his by the gift of the Father. And now we are prepared to raise the direct query with our opponents, Does the God of heaven set up the kingdom, or does he not? If the promise of 1 Chron. xvii, and the prophecy of Dan. ii, be admitted in their full force, viz., that the God of heaven does set up the kingdom, and settle and establish his Son in his kingdom, then we ask further, Is there any thing implied in the Father's setting up the kingdom but the crowning of the Son, or investing him with regal power and authority? Is there in all the Scriptures of truth a single act beyond

this ascribed to the Father in setting up the kingdom? And is not this work accomplished in heaven before the second advent of the Saviour?

- Rev. xi, 14-18; xiv, 14; xix, 16.

We understand that "these kings," referred to in Dan. ii, 44, are the divisions of the Roman Empire, symbolized by the feet and toes of the image, and the horns of the fourth beast of Dan. vii. In their days, at the termination of the priesthood of our Lord (Heb. viii, 1; Ps. cx, 1), the God of heaven bestows the kingdom upon his Son, and he receives the holy city, the capital of the kingdom, the New Jerusalem, "which is the mother of us all," the gift of which is represented by the figure of a marriage. See Matt. xxv, 1; Rev. xxi, 9, 10; comp. Isa. liv, 1, with Gal. iv, 26, 27.

The whole work brought to view in Dan. ii, 44, is plainly referred to in the passages above quoted, so that in the second proposition, concerning the breaking in pieces the kingdoms of the earth, but little remains to be said. The dashing in pieces of the nations, is always ascribed to Christ, and that it will take place at his coming has been proved in chap. ii, to which we refer. The symbol of the destruction of the governments of earth, is the stone smiting the image on the feet, when all parts of the image are broken and destroyed together. We locate this at the second advent. Where do the advocates of the Age to Come locate it? D. P. Hall said in the "Wisconsin Tent," in Sept. 1855, and was endorsed by J. M. Stephenson, that God had mighty blessings in store for the nations of the earth: that soon

the Devil would be bound, his deceptions cease, and the *nations* would then be saved as *individuals* now are. In 1858, Age-to-Come believers (Reed and Collings) at Crane's Grove, Ills., both in preaching and private conversation, denied that the Saviour would break in pieces what was given to him by the Father; one of them said it would be *folly* in the Saviour to receive a gift from the Father, and then break it in pieces! This is surely charging heaven itself with folly. See Psa. ii, 8, 9. "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces as a potters' vessel." By these it would appear that they consider that the advent of the Saviour will be a joyful event to the nations of the earth. That the tribes of the earth will have no occasion to mourn when they see him coming [see Matt. xxiv, 30]; for it will not come as a snare, nor be as it was in the days of Noah and of Lot [Luke xvii, 26-30; xxi, 35]; that sudden destruction will not come upon them, and they *shall escape*, even the inconveniences of the present system of *limited probation*! 1 Thess. iv, 16-18; v, 1-3.

We see by their teachings that they have no place for the smiting and breaking of the image till the thousand-years reign is past. The parts that composed the image were universal dominions; and the *stone* does not come peaceably to them and infuse its nature into them, and thus transform them into itself, as believers in a temporal millennium and Age to Come teach, but it

is also a universal dominion, which *destroys* and *supersedes* them. Neither can they with consistency quote Zech. xiv to show the events of the Age to Come, for "there shall be no more utter destruction" after the events spoken of in verses 4-11, but they admit of no utter destruction till the execution of the general judgment.

Against the view here presented that the kingdom is set up, and Christ commences his reign, in heaven, it is claimed that as Christ is called David's son, it would be inconsistent to transfer the reign, or any part of it, from the place where David reigned, or from earth to heaven. But it is not wisdom to aver what would be consistent for God to do when we have the means of knowing what he has done, and what he has promised to do. Notice the following facts:

1. Christ will reign for ever in the New Jerusalem, which will come down from heaven. David reigned in the old Jerusalem, and seven years in Hebron.

2. The reign over Israel has once been transferred from heaven to earth. It was God's kingdom, and he ruled over it. When the Israelites desired a king, he said: "They have rejected me that I should not reign over them." 1 Sam. viii, 7. David's was a secondary right, held by sufferance. Many talk as though David had the first and sole right, and as if everything was disorderly and illegal that differed from his reign.

3. Christ was born heir to David's throne; but partaking of our nature he died, as had all of David's sons before; and what he received by birth he lost by death, and his being David's son would

have availed him nothing had he remained dead. Thus, though born heir, he receives the throne by the gift of God, through the resurrection. "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David." Luke i, 32. "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption." Acts ii, 30, 31.

4. David had many sons, but Christ was superior to David, for he called him Lord. And David will also be raised from the dead, but Christ will supersede him in the throne. Though born son of David he would have had no special right to the throne had he not also been the Son of God. Ps. lxxxix, 27; 1 Chron. xvi, 13; Ps. xlv, 6, 7; comp. Heb. i.

5. As he is the Son of God, so his throne will be set in the house and city of God. Notice 1 Chron. xvii, 14: "I will settle him in *mine house* and in my kingdom for ever, and his throne shall be established for evermore." Also verse 12: "*He shall build me an house*, and I will establish his throne for ever."

These declarations make it clear that the first ruler over the kingdom *reigned in heaven*. They rejected him and desired a king "like all the nations." 1 Sam. viii, 20. And it has been abundantly proved that he "whose right it is" will commence his reign in the same locality. How

long he will continue to reign in heaven can only be known by ascertaining when the New Jerusalem will come down to earth. As that is the capital of his kingdom, the seat of power is of course determined by its location.

The foregoing view of the setting up of the kingdom and the commencement of the reign of Christ, is further proved by the fact that his people, the subjects of the kingdom [see Matt. xxi, 43; xxv, 34; Jas. ii, 5; Luke xix, 27], *are taken to heaven* when they are redeemed. We invite the careful attention of the reader to the proofs on this point.

John in prophetic vision saw a Lamb on Mount Zion, and with him an hundred and forty-four thousand. We have before shown that Mount Zion is in heaven. Again he said, "I heard a voice of *much people in heaven*, saying, Alleluia." Rev. xix, 1. This is after the Lord has judged Babylon, and "hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand." Verse 2. And it is after the resurrection, for they do not sing the song of triumph till after that event. 1 Cor. xv, 54, 55. In chap. xv, 2, he saw the triumphant company stand on a *sea of glass*, having the harps of God in their hands, and singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. In chap. iv, 1-6, which is a view of the heavenly temple, *the sea of glass is before the throne of God*. By referring to the work of Solomon we learn that a "molten sea" was made with the earthly temple. The expression, "a molten sea," well accords with John's description: "as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire." As the work of Solomon, as well as

that of Moses, was according to the pattern given [1 Chron. xxviii, 11, 12], the *antitypical sea* belongs in heaven, before the throne of God, with all the other articles typified, in that work. Heb. viii, 1-5. There is where the saints sing their triumph: on the sea of glass, before the throne of God, on Mount Zion, in heaven. Here is a harmony between the type and the prophetic view; and the promise of the Saviour fully sustains it.

Said Jesus to the Jews, "Ye shall seek me and shall not find me; and where I am, thither ye cannot come." John vii, 34-36. The Jews did not understand him, and said among themselves, "What manner of saying is this?" They knew it contemplated a departure from their midst, and thought perhaps he intended to leave them and go and teach the Gentiles. Many at this day are as blind over this passage as the Jews were; but if they had noted what the Saviour said as recorded in verse 33, they need not have queried whether he was going to the Gentiles, or to some remote corner of the earth; for he said plainly, "I go to him who sent me." "Where I am," was spoken prospectively, and signified the place to which he was going, not the place where he then was, for the Jews were there also. The Jews would not be able to come where he was when he went away; as Campbell renders it: "Nor be able to get thither where I shall be." As if he had said, thither, or to that place, where he is who sent me, ye cannot come.

Again, in chap. viii, 21, he said, "I go my way and ye shall seek me and shall die in your sins:

whither I go ye cannot come." But the blindness of the Jews was proverbial; and again they inquired, "Will he kill himself? because he saith, whither I go ye cannot come." When he told them that they could not go whither he went, namely, to him that sent him, they seemed to think he would go to the Gentiles; a supposition forbidden by the fact of their inability to go. So in the latter text; when he told them they should die, but could not go where he went, they wondered if he would kill himself! an idea as wild and extravagant as they could have entertained. If he had gone to the Gentiles, they could have gone also: if he had killed himself and they had died, the difference implied in the text would have been overcome. So far as these expressions to the Jews are concerned, all is plain.

In chap. xiii, 33-36, he used the same words to the disciples, except that he did not tell them they should die in their sins. But he said, "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me, and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go ye cannot come; so now I say to you." The suppositions of the Jews are contradicted by facts in their cases also. He did not go to the Gentiles, for thither the disciples went. He did not refer to death, for they died; nor yet to a special or particular manner of death, for they also died for the truth. But whither he was going he explained in chap. xiv, 12, 28, and xvii, 16: "I go unto the Father." That this is fulfilled, that he has ascended to the Father in heaven, it is unnecessary to offer proof, but there is a promise based upon these facts which we will now consider.

This promise is recorded in John xiv, 1-6. He said, "Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you." Where he went we have already seen—he went to the Father; to the Father's house, to prepare a place for the saints. But their hearts were troubled; for he had said to them as he had said to the Jews, that they could not come to the place to which he went. Now he continued: "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, **THAT WHERE I AM THERE YE MAY BE ALSO.**" We have seen that the expression, *Where I am*, denoted that place to which he was going; hence, the promise is that when he returned he would take them to the Father's house, where he was going. It may be supposed that this promise conflicts with his words in chap. xiii, 33: but the harmony is shown in verse 36, where he said, "**WHITHER I GO thou canst not follow me now, BUT THOU SHALT FOLLOW ME AFTERWARDS.**" This is a very plain statement, and justifies Campbell's rendering of chap. xiv, 3: "I will return and take you with me."

On this exposition of these texts we invite the criticisms of our opponents, confident that it will stand the severest test. We cannot imagine how any one can pretend to find any other view taught in these Scriptures, and therefore must wonder at the pertinacity of some who affirm that Christ will not reign in heaven, and that the saints will not go there. But not till they show that Christ ascended in mid-air, or in the clouds, and then

returned to Palestine, there to remain for ever, can we believe that the saints will only be taken into the clouds, and then return to earth, without going to the mansions prepared in the Father's house, whither Jesus has gone.

Prov. viii, 21 has been quoted to prove that the saints will not go to heaven. It reads, "That I may cause those that love me to inherit substance." This is quoted on the supposition that heaven is *unsubstantial*, and would be in point if God himself, his temple, and his throne, were non-entities, and Christ had gone *nowhere*. But Paul said to those that suffered loss for Christ's sake: "Knowing yourselves that YE HAVE IN HEAVEN A MORE ENDURING SUBSTANCE." Heb. x, 34. So we can assure those who look to Canaan or Jerusalem, because they desire substance, that we have a substance, even in heaven, undefiled and *more enduring*. That is perishable—it will be shaken by the voice of God, and be removed. This is eternal, it cannot be shaken; it is incorruptible, undefiled, and will not fade away.

CHAPTER IX.

THE DAY OF THE LORD.—ITS LENGTH, NATURE, &c.

An effort has been made to sustain the Age to Come by first *assuming* that the day of the Lord is identical with the 1000 years of Rev. xx, and then

quoting Zeeh. xiv to show a series of events transpiring on the earth "in that day," or during the 1000 years. But the Scriptures clearly show that the day of the Lord is longer than 1000 years, commencing before, and terminating after, that period. Peter does not give the length of that day, as has been inferred from 2 Pet. iii. In verses 8, 9, he refers solely to the faithfulness of God, and that his long suffering withholds the execution of his judgments on the scoffers; yet this is no evidence of slackness, as his promise is as sure 1000 years hence as if fulfilled to-day. With man haste is necessary to the performance of his promise, as his life is but a hand-breadth; but not so with God who is from everlasting to everlasting.

The day of the Lord commences before the advent. It has been shown that the voice of God shakes heaven and earth before the Saviour comes. Pages 25, 26. And Isa. xiii, 13 shows that they are shaken in that day. "Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger." And verses 6, 9. "Howl ye; for the day of the Lord is at hand; it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty. . . . Behold the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and to destroy the sinners thereof out of it." The great battle is in that day. Eze. xiii, 5; Rev. xvi, 14. It is called the day of the Lord's anger, the day of his wrath, &c.; and as in the seven last plagues "is filled up the wrath of God" [Rev. xv, 1], and the battle of that day

occurs under the seventh plague, and the heavens and earth are shaken in that day previous to the advent, it appears that that day commences with the pouring out of the plagues, at the termination of "the day of salvation." We have no more warrant to infer from 2 Pet. iii, that that day is just 1000 years long, than we have to infer that "the day of salvation" is of that length, and that day has already existed nearly two thousand years.

Again, should we admit that the saints reign on the earth during the 1000 years of Rev. xx, 4-6, the earth could not pass away or be melted till after the close of that time, for it is not melted till the judgment is executed on the resurrected wicked. But the wicked are not raised till the thousand years are finished; and Peter says that the heavens and earth which are now, are reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men: and that *in* the day of the Lord the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements melt with fervent heat. Thus we find that the resurrection of the wicked, the execution of the judgment, and the passing away of the heavens and earth, all take place *in* the day of the Lord, and *after* the termination of the 1000 years. Therefore, again, the day of the Lord and the 1000 years of Rev. xx, cannot be identical.

The descriptions of the day of the Lord as given in the Scriptures, and of the Age to Come as given by its exponents, are so different, that the reading of the texts should convince any one of their error. We will here copy a few scriptures on the subject, and would suggest to the reader to sub-

stitute the *Age to Come* for the *day of the Lord*, in these texts, and the difference between the Age to Come of the Bible, and that of J. Marsh's book will be quickly perceived.

Isa. xiii, 6, 9-13, "Howl ye; for the day of the Lord [Age to Come] is at hand; it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty. Behold the day of the Lord [or Age to Come] cometh, *cruel both with wrath and fierce anger*, TO LAY THE LAND DESOLATE," &c.

Jer. xlvi, 10. "For this is the day of the Lord God of hosts, a day of vengeance, that he may avenge him of his adversaries; and the sword shall devour, and it shall be satiate and made drunk with their blood; for the Lord God of hosts hath a sacrifice in the north country, by the river Euphrates." See Rev. xvi, 12-21.

Eze. xiii, 4, 5. "O Israel, thy prophets are like the foxes in the desert. Ye have not gone up into the gaps, neither made up the hedge for the house of Israel to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord." Also to verse 16.

Chap. xxx, 2, 3. "Thus saith the Lord God: Howl ye. Woe worth the day. For the day is near, even the day of the Lord is near, a cloudy day; it shall be the time of the heathen."

Joel i, 15. "Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord [or Age to Come] is at hand, and *as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come.*"

Chap. ii, 1, 2, 11. "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand. A day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of

clouds and of thick darkness. . . . And the Lord shall utter his voice before his army: for his camp is very great: for he is strong that executeth his word: for the day of the Lord [or Age to Come] *is great, and VERY TERRIBLE: and WHO CAN ABIDE IT.*" See verse 31.

Amos v, 18-20. "Woe unto you that desire the day of the Lord! to what end is it for you? the day of the Lord [Age to Come] *is darkness and not light.* As if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into the house, and leaned his hand on the wall and a serpent bit him. Shall not the day of the Lord [Age to Come] be darkness and not light; even *very dark, and no brightness in it?*"

Obad. 15, 16. "For the day of the Lord [Age to Come] is near *upon all the heathen:* as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee: thy reward shall return upon thine own head. For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall the heathen drink continually; yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and they shall be as though they had not been."

Zeph. i, 7, 8, 14-18. "Hold thy peace at the presence of the Lord God: for the day of the Lord is at hand: for the Lord hath prepared a sacrifice, he hath bid his guests. And it shall come to pass in the day of the Lord's sacrifice, that I will punish the princes, and the king's children, and all such as are clothed with strange apparel. . . . The great day of the Lord is near, it is near and hasteth greatly, even the voice of the day of the Lord; the mighty man shall cry there bitterly. *That day is a day [or age] of wrath, a day*

of trouble and distress, A DAY of WASTENESS AND DESOLATION, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness. A day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities, and against the high towers. And I will bring distress upon men, that they shall walk like blind men, because they have sinned against the Lord; and their blood shall be poured out as dust, and their flesh as the dung. Neither their silver nor their gold shall be able to deliver them in the day of the Lord's wrath; but the whole land shall be devoured by the fire of his jealousy: for he shall make even a speedy riddance of all them that dwell in the land." Compare Jer. xxv, 15-33. See also Isa. ii, 10-12; xxxiv, 1-10; 1 Thess. v, 2, 3; 2 Pet. iii, 10, 11; Rev. xvi; compare Joel iii, 9-14; Rev. xiv, 14-20; xix, 11-21.

This divine description is as different from the modern theory of that age as wrath is from mercy, and darkness from light. In the Scriptures it is *never* called, as the present age is, the accepted time, or day of salvation, wherein God calls to repentance, and offers mercy to sinners. This scripture outline should be sufficient to open the eyes of those who are following false applications of prophecy concerning the day of the Lord, or great day of God's wrath, now commonly termed the Age to Come.

THE DAY OF THE LORD IS THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.—On this point we have no controversy with those who teach the Age to Come and future probation. They hold that the saints will judge the world in the future age, and so do we; but

we differ with them very much on the nature and circumstances of the judgment. Their view is presented in the following extract from D. P. Hall on "the object of the present dispensation." He says :

"It is to gather out a peculiar people, a select and well-disciplined company to become Christ's associates in dispensing judgment and bestowing mercies upon the nations of earth. . . . The same is presented to the Corinthians by the apostle Paul, when he would shame them for referring their difficulties to an infidel tribunal. 'Do ye not know,' said he, 'that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?' 1 Cor. vi, 2. 3."

There are two points in the passage here quoted which show the fallacy of the view above presented. 1. The saints shall judge angels. We read of certain angels that sinned, that are "reserved unto judgment." 2 Pet. ii, 4. But we have not the remotest idea that they will be on probation in the Age to Come, or that "bestowing mercies" is a part of the judgment work. We presume all will allow that these are the only angels that the saints will judge. 2. The judgment referred to is distinct from any judgment in matters of "*this life*;" which would not be the case if they were to dispense judgment and bestow mercies on mortal probationers. "This life" is not peculiar to any dispensation, but expresses the mortal life which all of Adam's posterity enjoy in common.

This judgment, then, can only refer to the process by which is determined the punishment of *fallen angels* and *the wicked world*, whose period of probation having expired, nothing but the judgment and its final execution awaits them. This view is fully sustained by Jude 6. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto *the judgment of THE GREAT DAY*."

We have said that we have no controversy in regard to *the time* wherein the saints will judge the world. We all agree that it will be in the future age—the age next subsequent to the present. But we deny that they will sit in judgment on nations then living on probation, or that mercy will be connected with this judgment, any farther than it is recognized in the *degrees of punishment*. Matt. x, 15; Luke x, 12-14.* The Scriptures

* The saints judge the world and angels. By Rev. xx, 4, we learn that they sit on thrones of judgment; i. e., they reign during the judgment. As there are degrees of punishment it is evident that the determination of punishment is the work of the saints, and of course every mitigating circumstance must be considered. Thus, by a comparison of scriptures we understand that they are kings, priests, and judges, at the same time.

The idea of the work or office of a priest is generally drawn from that of the priests of the Jewish age, rather than from the definition of the word, or its use in the New Testament. Peter compares our worship, which is altogether unlike that of the Jews, to the work of the Jewish priests; in like manner a service in the future, unlike either, may be compared to the same. The word, *priest*, does not necessarily imply a mediator

do not sustain the assumption of our opponents. The expressions quoted from the prophets relative to that day do not admit it. But one question remains to consider, whether the saints remain in heaven during the judgment of that day, or return to earth at its commencement. As it is represented to be "a day of wrath," and never a day of mercy, so it is "a day of *wasteness and desolation* ; and as the Lord comes with his saints to *execute* the judgment at the termination of the 1000 years, the conclusion is unavoidable that the saints continue in heaven during the 1000 years, leaving the earth desolate that length of time. And those whom Satan gathers to battle during that period, are not those who have submitted to Christ, and been constituted loyal subjects of his kingdom (as we must conclude from the writers on the Age to Come), but the wicked nations raised from the dead. It has been urged that they are already deceived, and therefore the expression of his deceiving them will not apply : but that is to say that they who have been deceived can be deceived no more ! We consider that there is opportunity there for the greatest deception that has

or intercessor. The Greek is *hierous*, which is rendered by both Robinson and Greenfield, "one who performs the sacred rites." This, of course, might embrace a work of mediation or intercession, but neither of the above named lexicographers incorporates such a work in their definitions ; as that is a specific work, while the definitions are general.

All allow that the judgment referred to will be during the 1000 years ; but it is when their "reign on the earth" is yet prospective. Rev. v, 9, 10. On this reign see remarks on objection, p. 45.

ever been practised. Many of them died in the full belief that they were naturally immortal, and as time cannot be counted by the dead, when they awake, and behold the Son of God arranging his glorious kingdom, and the city prepared for the reception of the saints on earth, to them it will appear as if they had but passed the *transition* which they believed death to be. All of them have denied the word of God on some points, and they may be easily led to think it may fail them, and to believe they may take possession of the "beloved city." How dreadful to think that the deceived will remain deceived, and confident in their opposition to God and his word, till the fires of destruction envelop them ! We may imagine their unavailing regrets for their folly and their obstinacy. But he that believeth not the record which God hath given hath made him a liar, which is surely enough to sink any one to perdition. Then will the earth be made new ; "the purchased possession" be redeemed ; and the saints possess the kingdom "under the whole heaven."

In connection with these positive proofs concerning the day of the Lord we will notice the view of our opponents on Zech. xiv. We do not enter upon an exposition of this chapter, for the reason that we do not sufficiently understand the nature of the antitypical feast of tabernacles. We hold that it is no disparagement to our view that we are not able to fully explain every passage of scripture. It is enough if we give positive testimonies in favor of the doctrine ; for the word of the Lord being yea and amen (not yea and nay),

we need not fear that an obscure passage will contradict a plain one. Though we may not be able to give a full exposition of every text in the prophecies claimed in support of the doctrine of the millennium, yet we may feel the strongest assurance that they will not contradict the plain declarations we have quoted on that subject. So any number of disputed passages will not unsettle the testimony of the direct proofs we have given concerning the day of the Lord. And it will appear plain that our opponents have no ground for their assumptions on Zech. xiv, by the following points :

(1) We have shown that the day of the Lord is more than 1000 years in length : and the events of verse 4 are evidently at the close of that day, after the 1000 years, and not at the beginning as claimed by our opponents. Their claim being founded on the supposed identity of the day of the Lord and the 1000 years.

(2) At the time referred to, "there shall be no more utter destruction" [verse 11], which shows that there has been an *utter destruction* in the past. This is contrary to the view of our opponents relative to the Age to Come.

(3) We have shown the fallacy of their views on the re-institution of the types: hence, the feast of tabernacles is antitypical, whereas the arguments of the advocates of the Age to Come are on the supposition that it is the same as the former observance under the Levitical law ; and therefore their view is erroneous.

CHAPTER X.

NO PROBATION AFTER THE COMING OF CHRIST.

The proper method of investigating scripture subjects is to first notice the explicit declarations relative to them, and next ascertain what bearing the great leading doctrines of the Bible have on them, and let minor objections be an after consideration. And any objection to be valid must involve a contradiction between the doctrine objected to and plain declarations, or between it and other doctrines settled beyond a doubt. If an objection is based on a particular passage of scripture, and the objector fails to show the sense of that scripture, he does not show that any objection really exists.

When I speak of settling the main points, and removing objections, I do not mean that all must necessarily be convinced; that is altogether too much to expect. Some people will not be convinced of their errors. We have noticed with regret the disposition of some to cling to *their construction* of some portion of prophecy, which they themselves cannot fully explain, and apply it to favor their views of the Age to Come, regardless of plain texts opposing, or of the bearing of great leading truths on the subject. I have endeavored in the briefest possible manner to show that

1. The clearest and most definite prophecies point to the coming of Christ as the time of the destruction of all his enemies.

2. The prophecies of Daniel and John, given

in symbols agreeing with the declarations of the other prophets, clearly show that all the nations of the earth will be "dashed in pieces" at that time.

3. The New Covenant mediation is in the present dispensation, and in the present only; hence its blessings can only be secured by obtaining an interest in them in this dispensation.

4. The Old Covenant did not and could not of itself secure the favor or grace of God to those with whom it was made; and of course their descendants can claim nothing under it.

5. The New Covenant holds out no hope of special blessings to the Jews, but its promises extend to all alike, through faith, and will be fully realized in the new earth.

6. There is no promise of the restoration or re-building of "Jerusalem which now is."

7. The kingly priesthood of Christ is entirely in the present dispensation.

8. The great work of subduing the enemies of Christ, claimed for the Age to Come, will be accomplished before the second advent.

From these and other considerations we conclude there will be no probation after Christ comes.

Besides those who are tenacious of *their constructions* of the prophecies, regardless of the facts and principles which preclude the possibility of such construction being correct, there are others who are honestly striving for the truth, but have also imbibed erroneous views of the prophecies. And as we claim no infallibility for ourselves—nothing but an earnest desire to know the truth

—we are liable to be found in this position. We discover that students of the Bible have arrived at far different conclusions on the same subjects, and we are led to conclude that on one side or the other there has been a wrong starting point; wrong premises have been laid; or an unjust process of reasoning adopted. Thus we see the importance of having something by which to test our views and the justness of our conclusions. And if there were no general principles, plain and well-defined, no definite facts or declarations on which we can and must agree, we could scarcely expect to come to the "full assurance of faith," any further than assurance is founded on confidence in our own imperfect judgments. We trust that in these pages our positions have been sustained by declarations of sacred wit, sufficiently plain and clear to satisfy the faithful lovers of God's truth. To silence cavils we do not pretend. God's word itself does not aim at this. He who is infinite in his resources could doubtless have accomplished such a purpose had he designed it, and made every truth as plain and undeniable as the shining of the sun at mid-day; but then faith would have been precluded. God would not have been honored in the belief of a truth so given. So we feel clear before God when we have presented proofs sufficient to convince those who love God and tremble at his word.

The principles that remain to be considered in their relation to each other, and bearing directly on the point in question, are more general than any that have been considered. They are the bases of all revelation, and all the purposes of

God towards man; the foundations on which the superstructures of both testaments are erected. These all-controlling principles are

"THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL."

The truths relative to these great fundamental principles are stated in plain terms; and there can be but little chance for an issue in regard to either premise or conclusion. We argue that all the unconverted (all who are not justified by faith) will be cut off at Christ's coming, and the consequent impossibility of subsequent probation from

THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE LAW.—This truth is so easy of demonstration, yes, so evident of itself, that we feel that we have a right to use the words of the apostle to every Bible believer: "We write no other things unto you than what ye read or acknowledge." The universality of the law we urge: (1.) on the acknowledged *supremacy of God*; and (2.) on the authority of plain declarations of scripture. To deny it is to deny both the scripture and God's sovereignty.

Rom. iii, 19: "Now we know that whatsoever things the law saith, it saith *to them who are under the law*; THAT EVERY MOUTH MAY BE STOPPED, AND ALL THE WORLD MAY BECOME GUILTY BEFORE GOD."

God is supreme—"his kingdom ruleth over all;" his law is binding on all, and all are amenable to him as the one "Law-giver." Not only so, but all are transgressors of his law. The scriptures are very plain on this subject, yet it is virtually denied by some to sustain their theories, who assert that the heathen have not now a suffi-

cient opportunity to obtain salvation. And that there is an absolute necessity for *a new system of probation* under more favorable circumstances to be established in the future, to give them a more reasonable chance for life, and thus to vindicate the justice of God! Monstrous as this appears in the light of God's revealed plan of salvation, I have heard it publicly advanced by a teacher of the Age to Come.*

Every one possessed of the Spirit of the gospel must entertain feelings of pity for the heathen, as for all others under the dark and blighting influences of sin. The apostle felt for them, and was willing to lay down his life for the privilege of laying the offer of life before them; but having the mind of Christ, he "knew what was in man," and faithfully described his natural state. See Rom. i, 18-32; iii, 9, 19.

Missionaries, and all who have dwelt in heathen lands, and authentic history, assure us that wickedness of the most abominable kinds, and to an awful extent, prevails and has ever prevailed among the heathen. Of a truth it is said, "The dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty." We are informed by those who have resided among them, that their ignorance of right is not so great as their hatred of right. Those

*These are the words of Mr. Curry, used in his argument for the Age to Come, in Ingham Co., Mich., in the winter of 1855-6. *A new system of probation* is nothing less than *another gospel*. The language of D. P. Hall, previously noticed, tends to the same conclusion.

who claim another probation for them attribute their wickedness to their blindness and ignorance; whereas *the Scriptures attribute their blindness to their wickedness*. Rom. i, 28. "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind." See also verses 22-26; compare Isa. xxix, 13, 14; Rom. xi, 7-10, 20; 2 Thess. ii, 11, 12. Of the very best of the heathen, their sages and philosophers, Melancthon observed, "I admit that there were found in Socrates, Xenocrates, and Zeno, constancy, temperance, chastity. Those shadows of virtue existed in impure minds, and sprang from self-love; and therefore ought they to be regarded not as genuine virtues, but as vices." Of this expression the celebrated historian D'Aubigné says: "This may seem a harsh judgment, but only when Melancthon's meaning is misapprehended. No man felt more disposed than he was to own that the Pagans had virtues worthy of human esteem; but he maintained that great truth, that the supreme law given by God to all his creatures is, that they should love him above all things. Now, should man in doing God's commands, act from love to himself, not from love to God, could God ever approve of his thus daring to substitute himself in the room of his Infinite Majesty? And would there not be vice in an act involving express rebellion against the supreme God?"

It must be confessed that all whose minds have not been renewed by grace through faith (which, of course, includes the heathen), are considered carnally minded. But "the carnal mind is enmity

against God, for it is not subject to the law of God." This justifies the sentence that "to be carnally minded is death." To the same intent, and of the same general application are the words of Paul in Gal. v, 19-21. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strifes, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like." These are placed in opposition to the fruits of the Spirit; and as surely as the fruits or graces of the Spirit abound where the Spirit dwells, and the Spirit cannot dwell where these are not, so do those prevail in all flesh, where the flesh with its affections and lusts is not crucified, or subdued by the grace of God. Not that all have outwardly committed all these crimes, but they inhere in the carnal mind, and are very often more restrained by circumstances than by the will. That which is perfectly subject to the law of God is perfect in love, for "love is the fulfilling of the law." But that which is enmity against God, and not subject to his law, is complete in hatred to God, and a transgressor of his holy law in every respect. That all are by nature the children of wrath, and have carnal minds, will not be denied; and therefore all who are not justified by faith and made at peace with God through Christ, are in the deplorable condition described by the apostle.

Perhaps none would claim exceptions to general declarations of this kind. Yet should they do so, we find scripture declarations sufficiently particular to meet every objection. Having noticed

the testimony respecting the world of mankind, we next hear it said of the *classes*, "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin." Rom. iii, 9. Then of the *individuals* "it is written: There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood. Destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes." Rom. iii, 10-18.

The following plain statements lead to our conclusions on this point:—

'The wages of sin is death.' Rom. vi, 23.

"All have sinned." Chap. iii, 23.

Therefore all are under condemnation to death. Verse 19.

These truths need neither confirmation or comment; if any would deny them we have only to say, "Who art thou that repliest against God?" But they might as well deny the statements at once as to deny the conclusions to which they unavoidably lead. As surely as these scripture statements are true, so surely are they fatal to the position we call in question. They would be a sufficient vindication of the justice of God should he at this instant destroy them all from the face of the earth. And they must and will be so de-

stroyed when the judgments of God fall on a guilty world. See 2 Thess. i, 8; Ps. ii, 8, 9; Eze. xxx, 3; Joel iii, 9-13.

Having thus shown the universality of the law of God and the extent of the condemnation incurred by man, it only remains to examine

THE MEANS AND CONDITIONS OF THE GOSPEL.—The means by which we receive justification, remission of sins, and eternal life, are the death and mediation of Jesus Christ; and the conditions on which we receive them are "*repentance towards God*," whose law has been transgressed, and "*faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ*," who redeems us from the curse of the law. Acts xx, 21. His death was necessary, because "without shedding of blood is no remission" [Heb. ix, 22; Lev. xvii, 11-14]; his mediation is necessary to present that blood to his Father and make intercession for us. And we further find that the manner and place of making the atonement are definitely revealed in the plan. In *manner* it is conformable to the example given in the type; its place is the heavenly sanctuary. Heb. viii, 1-5; ix, 23, 24. I have before quoted the scriptures to show that this is a unit work; that Christ himself is the only offering acceptable to God in the sinner's behalf; that his blood is offered but once; that his intercession is in but one place; that there is but one mediator; and that he resigns his mediatorial office before his coming. The important question then arises, What is required of the sinner, in order that he may have an interest in the work of the Saviour, and be able to "stand in the battle in the day of

the Lord," and escape those plagues which are coming on the earth when "the wrath of the Lamb" is manifested against the ungodly? A few quotations from the word will show this.

John iii, 16. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth in him* should not perish."

Luke xiii, 3. "Except ye *repent* ye shall all likewise perish."

Heb. xii, 14. "Follow peace with all men, and *holiness*, without which no man can see the Lord."

Rom. viii, 9. "Now if any man have not *the Spirit of Christ* he is none of his."

1 Cor. xvi, 22. "If any man *love not* the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be an accursed creature."

Gal. iii, 23. "The scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise *by faith of Jesus Christ* might be given *to them that believe*."

1 Pet. iv, 18. "And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and sinner appear?"

The promise is only to those in whose characters are developed faith, repentance, holiness, spiritual mindedness, who are pure in heart and righteous, at the coming of Christ. Such will be redeemed and have the glorious boon of immortality or eternal life conferred on them "when Christ who is our life shall appear." What of those who are not holy? They must surely perish, for they are even now under condemnation according to the scriptures we have quoted. And there is no middle ground between them that are saved and them that perish. Said the Saviour: "He that

is *not with me is against me*, and he that *gathereth not with me scattereth abroad*." Matt. xii, 30. There is no neutral ground. It is either gathering or scattering; righteous or wicked; life or death. Not the bare absence of inveterate or openly avowed hatred, but active, perfect love is required. Not merely abstinence from great out-breaking sins, but holiness of heart, and walking in the Spirit.

I ask all, and entreat them to answer in the fear of God, and in humble reverence for his word, is there any medium between those "under the law," and those "under grace?" There cannot be; for as "all have sinned," all are originally under the law; and none can be brought from under the law except by being placed under grace, or redeemed from the curse of the law by Christ. If they could, the cross of Christ would be of no effect. There can be no ground between condemnation and justification. All who are not justified necessarily remain condemned; and those who are not condemned are only freed therefrom by being justified. If there will be a class who will escape the judgments of God without availing themselves of the benefits of the gospel of Christ, then the gospel is local and limited in its application.

To those who yet claim that it is necessary for God to place the Jews and heathen on a new probation in order to vindicate his justice, I would ask, Has not the present generation of Jews and heathens as good opportunities to know God's will as the past generations have had? If so (and indeed it has better), has God been unjust to past generations? And if a new probation is

necessary for these, would it not be equally necessary that those be raised from the dead and put on a new probation also? We should rather think that they who thus teach are charging God foolishly. Such vain reasonings and inferences will not settle so great a subject. Three things will be required of them: to show by plain Bible declarations, (1) that future probation is a scripture truth; (2) the means and conditions on which it will be based; and (3) the class or classes who will then and there be placed on probation. Direct proof on each of these points to sustain that theory is altogether lacking.

A letter written a few years since by J. M. Stephenson on this subject contains the following remarks:

"As for your quotations I can make no issue. I believe every one when placed just where the Bible places them, namely, in the Jewish and Christian dispensations; but they prove nothing either for or against probation in the Age to Come, because they have no reference whatever to that dispensation. To prove that probation, in the present dispensation, will close when Christ comes, and to prove that there will be no probation in the future age, are very different things."

The above may, with propriety, be called a play upon words. We have never thought it necessary to prove that "probation in the present dispensation will close when Christ comes," for it is universally admitted that the dispensation itself closes at that time; and of course probation *in this dispensation* could not possibly continue after the dispensation terminated. One truth is

undeniable, to wit: that *all are on probation in this dispensation*; and that the probation of all ceases before Christ comes is evident from the proofs adduced that all are under condemnation, or "subject to the judgment of God" [Rom. iii, 29, *margin*], and I have never yet heard of any method by which *condemned probationers* of this age may be *shoved over* and given a new and different probation in another age. Reason, justice, and scripture all show that they will be held to account under the claims of the present age, in which they are already under condemnation. The judgment of all classes is clearly revealed, and the time given in Rom. ii, 12-16. Any system to give them another probation in another age would do violence to revealed principles.

Again Mr. S. said in the same letter:

"God's mode of saving men may change without change in principle. It was not the same in the Jewish dispensation it is in the Christian."

In these quotations it will be noticed there is an acknowledgment that probation terminates with this dispensation, though he thinks it will be renewed in another; and that the mode of salvation would be different from that of this age. But the latter declaration, in this connection is somewhat ambiguous; for, if by the "*mode of saving men*" he merely refers to positive institutions, his statement does not reach the case as will be shown; but if by it he would embrace the plan of salvation, he is in error. This plan has never changed. It has ever been the same, though there have been different methods of illustrating and enforcing its saving truths on the minds of his

people. Each shadow of the Jewish age was equivalent to a promise; and these promises are now in process of fulfillment, and the work will be finished when the sanctuary is cleansed, prior to Christ's coming,* and not one declaration of the word of God can be produced to show that its conditions will apply to any in a future age.

A reference to a change of "mode" and a change of dispensation is of no avail, as there was no termination of probation at the close of that age, nor did the judgment then set upon the transgressors of that age, as will be the case at the close of this. Hence, there is no analogy; it is reasoning from unlike to unlike. The question is not properly in regard to a change of types, memorials, or positive institutions, but to the duration of the gospel system on which all these depend for their existence.

Positive institutions are only relative in importance; those of the Jewish dispensation looked forward to the work of Christ in his death and mediation [Heb. viii, 1-5], and without this they would have been of no importance whatever. The positive institutions of this age refer to the same things. But here again we note a difference: those of the Jewish age all looked beyond that into the present age, while those of the present do not look into the future. The close of this age is the last link in the chain. All past dispensa-

*This of course refers to the work of intercession and atonement. The blessing of the people by the High Priest, and putting to death the transgressors, are fulfilled at his coming. Heb. ix, 28; 2 Thess. i, 7, 8.

tions have been clearly connected, but there is no connecting link between this and any future time of probation. As this departs, the judgment of the great day of God's wrath opens before us. The Saviour's work in the heavenly sanctuary will then be finished: he has entered heaven once as a priest after the order of Melchisedec: when he leaves that station the saints will be sealed with the seal of the living God, and the filthy and the unjust will be so still.

It is easy to perceive how a change of positive institutions has taken place in the past, in strict conformity with established principles, as they all refer to a work now being done. "Things hoped for" are symbolized in this manner, but when his intercession ceases—when the atonement is fully made, they can have no further efficacy, as no remission can be granted after that time except on the principle of granting *indulgence for future sins*, by pardoning the crime before it is committed.

CONCLUSION.

PRESENT TRUTH.

Those who teach a probationary future age are mostly professed believers in the near approach of the second advent of the Saviour. But solemn as are the scenes connected with that great event, there is nothing in the doctrine that can possibly assist in the work of preparation for that great day. It has been admitted by them that it is not *present truth*—does not inculcate present duty—does not contain a present test of character. They do not even profess to think that those who hear the gospel in this age can be benefitted by the probationary system of that. Therefore could they prove it to be truth, according to their own admissions, by no possible effort can they benefit any by its proclamation.

But we look beyond these admissions of the *uselessness* of the doctrine. We consider it injurious. It is not merely a theory devoid of life and power, destitute of the vital principle of present truth, but it is *opposed* to present truth, and is therefore a most dangerous enemy of souls in these fearful times. Some have endeavored to amalgamate it with the third angel's message, but this has ever proved a failure. When Eld. Curry, in 1856, undertook to defend it, he was obliged to take positions subversive of his own professed faith. He then said he could harmonize his two positions; but a few months convinced him to the contrary. In the fall of 1858 Eld. Stephen-

son told me his mistake had been in trying to harmonize the third angel's message with the Age-to-Come. He had become convinced it could not be done. But how do they avoid our arguments for the message? Not by proving them inconsistent with the scripture, but by endeavors to place the message far in the past or in the future age. Whether in the past or in the future seems to them immaterial, if it can only be removed from the present.

Those who argue that the third angel's message was given in the past uniformly locate it in the days of Luther. It needs but little argument to refute this position. The three messages of Rev. xiv must retain their *relative order*, as well as their relation to other parts of the book. Verse 6 says the *first* message was given by "*another angel*." As the book of Revelation consists of several lines or chains of prophecy, reaching to the same point, to wit, the coming of Christ, by considering the relation of the various links of the chains to that event we may easily discover the parallels in each. The vision of the sounding of the trumpets reaches to the coming of Christ. Chap. xi, 15-19. Chap. xiv reaches to the same time and embraces the same events revealed in chap. xi, 15-18. John had seen seven angels with trumpets, but he always speaks of them in the numerical order in which they appeared, as "*the first angel*," "*the second angel*," &c. When "*the fourth angel*" had sounded he saw "*an angel*," not of that order or number, proclaiming woes upon the earth. The first woe was under the sounding of the fifth angel, commencing in

1299. See Croley and Litch. This continued 150 years, or till 1449. The second woe under the sixth angel continued 391 years, or till 1840. After this another angel was seen before the seventh angel sounded. This was the second angel not embraced in the seven. In chapters xii, xiii, are a series of events covering the same time as the trumpets, and chap. xiv, may be called a sequel to these. This chain also reaches down to the coming of Christ. As the word, *another*, in chap. xiv, 6, shows that reference is made to one in the past, we turn back to find the preceding relative to this. If the angel of Rev. viii, 13, which announces the woes, is the *other* one intended in the prophecy, then it must be allowed that that of chap. xiv, 6 is identical with that of chap. x, 1, which would locate the messages after the second woe, and of course not in the Reformation. But if the identity of these be denied, then we must look to chap. x for the one next preceding chap. xiv, 6; but as the chronology of that of chap. x is fixed to a certainty, this view would bring the first message still a little later; in either case the messages are brought into the present century.

"The hour of his judgment is come," is the declaration of the first message. That the judgment comes under the seventh trumpet or third woe, is shown by Rev. xi, 15-18. "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying: The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever. And the four and twenty elders which sat before

God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshiped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and shalt be; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth." This message was not given by the apostles, for they preached that God had appointed a day in which he would judge the world, but they never spoke of it as then present. Neither did Luther, for he said he thought it would be about 300 years in the future from his time. They all preached in harmony with the Saviour's fulfillment of prophecy. Compare Isa. lxi, 1-3, with Luke iv. 16-21. "The acceptable year of the Lord," or "accepted time," was as far as the Saviour and his disciples or the reformers declared the fulfillment of the prophecy; it was reserved to the angel of Rev. xiv, to announce the fulfillment of the remainder in its appointed time. And if Luther and the reformers had not come up to the first message in their day they certainly did not give the third.

Again, the third message is founded on the series of facts in Rev. xiii. By comparing the first ten verses of this chapter with Dan. vii, and both with historical facts, we find it to be a symbol of the Roman hierarchy. The wound on this beast refers to a deprivation of power in 1798, at the end of the forty-two months. Verse 5. This

shows the work of the two-horned beast to be since 1798, as it causes the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast who had received the deadly wound (and yet lived); and to receive a mark in their foreheads or in their hands. The third angel's message is founded on these facts, and therefore cannot apply to any past generation.

But most of the advocates of the Age-to-Come profess to believe that the three messages of Rev. xiv, 6-12, will be given *after* the second advent. The evidence to disprove this theory is most plain and positive.

The announcement of Rev. xiv, 6, 7, "The hour of his judgment is come," belongs to this dispensation, preceding the advent. To evade this, and place the message in the future, a new rendering of the original has been offered. The words from which the *everlasting gospel* is translated are *euangelion aionion*. A book entitled "Bible vs. Tradition," renders it "*the gospel of the [millennial] age.*" As the author of the book professes to have a critical knowledge of the language, we can but think that he was aware of the fact that *euangelion* is the noun, and *aionion* the adjective; and of course such a rendering is unwarranted. The *age-lasting gospel* gives a very good idea of the original, but the "gospel of the age" does not. The evidence is clear that this message was given by the body of advent believers up to 1844. This was the faith of those engaged in that work. The *Advent Shield*, published in that year, says:

"We look upon the proclamation which has

been made, as being the cry of the angel who proclaimed, '*the hour of his judgment is come.*' Rev. xiv, 6, 7. It is a sound which is to reach all nations; it is the proclamation of '*the everlasting gospel,*' or '*the gospel of the kingdom.*' In one shape or other, this cry has gone abroad through the earth wherever human beings are found, and we have had opportunity to hear of the fact." *Art. Rise and Progress of Adventism, by J. Litch.* See also tract entitled, "The Last Hour," published at the *Advent Herald Office.*

The precise nature of the work announced by this message we have not time and space here to investigate, but would refer to our published works on the subject of the sanctuary. The difficulty we have to contend with on this point in the minds of opposers is not a difficulty in regard to the facts, but to opinions; the opinions of the majority, on the judgment, being most vague and indefinite. On this subject we introduce another quotation from the *Advent Shield*, the sentiment of which is widely different from the common views, but, as far as it goes, fully accords with ours:

"We are inclined to the opinion that the judgment is after death, and before the resurrection: and that before that event the acts of all men will be adjudicated; so that the resurrection of the righteous is their full acquittal and redemption—their sins being blotted out when the times of refreshing shall have come [Acts iii, 19]; while the fact that the wicked are not raised proves that they were previously condemned." *Review of Prof. Bush on the Resurrection, by S. Bliss.*

There is a third class not referred to in the

above extract; the righteous who do not sleep, but are changed at the coming of the Lord. Their judgment must also be prior to the resurrection, as their translation is equivalent to a resurrection; and of course, their judgment takes place while they live upon the earth. To them the announcement of the judgment come is of the deepest importance, and they alone will be benefited by the subsequent messages.

That the second message, "Babylon is fallen," belongs to a period prior to the advent, is made plain by considering the order of events laid down in the scripture. In Rev. xiv, 8, is the simple announcement of the fall of Babylon, with the reason, while in chap. xviii, 1-5, a mighty angel announces the fall and its consequences. This angel gives the following events and call in order:

1. Babylon is fallen.
2. She is become the habitation of devils.
3. Come out of her my people.
4. In one day shall her plagues come.

By this we see also that the fall of Babylon is not her destruction as is often claimed, but it is a moral fall; for she becomes the habitation of devils *after* her fall; God's people are called out of her *after* she becomes the habitation of devils; and her destruction is threatened *after* the people of God are called out of her. The location of the plagues is shown in connection with the third message. This message says, "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup

of his indignation," &c. We might argue various points to show that this message is inappropriate to a future age, as the powers symbolized by the beast and image will be destroyed at the coming of the Lord, but the plain declarations of Scripture make an argument unnecessary. In chap. xvi, is given a description of the "seven last plagues," in which is filled up the wrath of God. That this is identical with the wrath of God threatened in the third angel's message is evident, as the first plague falls on the very individuals denounced in the message. It says, "The first [angel] went and poured out his vial upon the earth; and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshipped his image." Rev. xvi, 2.

By verses 12-15 we learn that six of the plagues will be poured out before the Lord comes. They read: "And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared. And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

This is conclusive evidence that the Third

Message precedes the plagues, and the plagues precede the coming of Christ.

Again, we have proved that the shaking of heaven and earth, or the powers of the heavens, as the Saviour expresses it, is by the voice of God, and in immediate connection with the advent. But this voice is heard under the pouring out of the seventh — the last — plague. Under this plague the judgment is consummated upon great Babylon. Here is the great battle of the day of the Lord. Here is the complete overthrow of God's enemies, and the eternal redemption of his people. Here the full separation takes place. While the slain of the Lord are from one end of the earth to the other, ungathered, unburied, unlamented (Jer. xxv), food for the fowls of heaven who are called to the supper which the great God has prepared for them, to feed on the rich, the proud, the great of this earth (Rev. xix), the servants of God, who have stood stiffly for the truth, who have kept the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, despite the rage of the Beast and False Prophet, are caught away by their glorious Head to the New Jerusalem, the mansions in heaven, to sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb. How different the fates of the two classes! And to be decided by the *present* truth, the Third Angel's Message. And this Message is doing its work, calling out a people to attend to *present duty*, to prepare for the great events impending at the close of the present age, and the setting up of God's everlasting kingdom.

The work of the Third Angel's Message, though despised by the world, and small in their sight,

like that of Noah among the antediluvians, is great in its consequences; and to it may be truly applied the words of the prophet: "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish; for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you." Acts xiii, 41.